

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, March 14, 1972

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. James E. Rogers, chaplain, Veterans' Administration hospital, Columbia, S.C., offered the following prayer:

Most merciful and gracious God whom we reverently worship and adore, as we enter this day of labor may we be inspired with Thy wisdom and holy direction in the ongoing of Thy kingdom.

Cleanse us from unselfish ways toward our fellow man and may we be more committed in cultivating the noble skills of creativeness in the heart of brotherly living.

May we aspire to emulate the faithfulness of our fathers who enriched the great heritage of America. May the blessed ministry of this dedicated body help all Americans in our common task as trustees of freedom.

We thank Thee for the faithful efforts of our President, our Speaker, and Members of Congress who search to help all humanity achieve the life which holds eternal truth.

Hear us and speak to us O God. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

On March 8, 1972:

H.R. 12067. An act making appropriations for foreign assistance and related programs for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, and for other purposes.

On March 9, 1972:

H.R. 1824. An act for the relief of Clinton M. Hoose;

H.R. 2714. An act for the relief of Mrs. Kayo N. Carvell;

H.R. 2792. An act for the relief of Juanita SAVEDIA VARELA;

H.R. 2846. An act for the relief of Roy E. Carroll;

H.R. 4497. An act for the relief of Lloyd B. Earle;

H.R. 4779. An act for the relief of Nina Daniel;

H.R. 6291. An act to provide for the disposition of funds arising from judgments in Indian Claims Commission dockets Nos. 178 and 179, in favor of the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation, and for other purposes;

H.R. 6998. An act for the relief of Salman M. Hilmy;

H.R. 7316. An act for the relief of Mrs. Norma McLeish; and

H.R. 7871. An act for the relief of Robert J. Beas.

On March 10, 1972:

H.R. 11738. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of

Defense to lend certain equipment and to provide transportation and other services to the Boy Scouts of America in connection with Boy Scout jamborees, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 8293. An act to continue until the close of September 30, 1973, the International Coffee Agreement Act of 1968.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 659) entitled "An act to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965, the Vocational Education Act of 1963, the General Education Provisions Act—creating a National Foundation for Postsecondary Education and a National Institute of Education—the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Public Law 874, 81st Congress, and related acts, and for other purposes," agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. PELL, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. MONDALE, Mr. EAGLETON, Mr. CRANSTON, Mr. DOMINICK, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. SCHWEIKER, Mr. BEALL, and Mr. STAFFORD to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed concurrent resolutions of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 67. Concurrent resolution to authorize the Secretary of the Senate to make a technical correction in the enrollment of the bill (S. 888) providing for the relief of David J. Crumb; and

S. Con. Res. 68. Concurrent resolution to authorize the preparation of official duplicates of S. 2097.

OUR GUEST CHAPLAIN, REV. JAMES E. ROGERS

(Mr. SPENCE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker and colleagues, our guest chaplain for this morning was the Reverend James E. Rogers, from Columbia, S.C., in my district. I would just like to let the Members know that Chaplain Rogers has been very active for many years in ministering to the veterans throughout this country. As a matter of fact, he is a past national chaplain for the Disabled American Veterans of the United States, and he is now the State chaplain for the Forty-and-Eight Society of the South Carolina Department of the American Legion. He has been chaplain of our Veterans' Administration hospital in Columbia for many years and has been with the VA for a total of 25 years.

Chaplain Rogers was raised in a Methodist children's home in North Carolina and later attended Atlantic Christian College and Duke University School of Religion. Somehow he also found time to participate and earn letters in four major sports.

During World War II, he answered his country's call and served on active duty as a chaplain for a period of 4 years. Thus you will readily note that he has devoted his adult life to the service of those men and women, both past and present, who have worn the uniform of one of our Armed Forces.

As a further indication of Chaplain Roger's outstanding service, I should also tell you that he has been nominated for the Federal Employee of the Year Award in my State. We are highly honored to have this distinguished member of the clergy with us today.

ARMY REFUSES TO SUPPLY FACTS

(Mr. PIKE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous material.)

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Speaker, since last May I have been trying to get the facts on the costs involved in the transfer of Army intelligence units from Fort Holabird, Md., to Fort Huachuca, Ariz. The GAO wrote me on August 5 saying the report would be in my hands by October 1971.

On November 3 they wrote to me saying that they could not do it because:

The progress of our work has been hampered by problems in obtaining access to pertinent documents of the Department of the Army.

The basic fact is that I still cannot get the facts. All a Congressman can get is letters telling him why he cannot have the facts.

Mr. Speaker, the letters I refer to are as follows:

GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE,
Washington, D.C., August 5, 1971.

B-173556.

Hon. OTIS G. PIKE,

House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. PIKE: Reference is made to your request of July 7, 1971, that we examine into the move of certain Army Intelligence units from Fort Holabird, Maryland, to Fort Huachuca, Arizona, and the proposed establishment of an Army Intelligence Center.

In accordance with our discussions in a meeting with you on July 29, 1971, this is to confirm that we expect to have a report on these matters to you by the end of October 1971.

Sincerely yours,

R. W. GUTMANN
(For Director).

GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE,
Washington, D.C., November 3, 1971.

B-173556.

Hon. OTIS G. PIKE,

House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. PIKE: This is in further reference to your request of July 7, 1971, that we examine into the move of certain Army Intelli-

gence units from Fort Holabird, Maryland, to Fort Huachuca, Arizona, and the proposed establishment of an Army Intelligence Center.

In our letter of August 5, 1971, we informed you that we expected to have a report to you by the end of October 1971. As discussed with your Office on October 29, 1971, however, the progress of our work has been hampered by problems in obtaining access to pertinent documents of the Department of the Army, and our expected date of reporting to you has been delayed to January 1972.

Sincerely yours,

R. W. GUTMANN
(For Director).

OIL MONOPOLY DEMANDS PRICE INCREASE

(Mr. VANIK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, this morning's newspapers reported that the Independent Petroleum Association of America's request for a 25-percent increase in the price of crude oil is being investigated by the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice.

The IPAA, a trade association of supposedly independent and competitive producers apparently made a group presentation to the Price Commission for this major increase in prices during phase II.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the Antitrust Division will do a better job of protecting the American public in this case than it did in the ITT case.

In addition, a price increase of 25 percent—or any amount—is absolutely unconscionable in this industry.

The American public is already subsidizing domestic oil profits and production through the oil import quota program—a program that costs the American consumer between \$5 and \$7 billion a year.

Instead of increased oil prices, a repeal of the oil import quota program would cut oil and gas prices in this country by 40 percent. Rather than granting a price increase, the Price Commission should immediately recommend a suspension of the oil import quota program.

MANDATORY JAIL SENTENCES FOR USE OF A FIREARM IN THE COMMISSION OF A CRIME

(Mr. CLEVELAND asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, America's cities are dominated by violent crime, with millions of Americans living in a state of fear. The response of some is to advocate strict gun control—or confiscation—laws, despite the fact that what is really needed is tough treatment of any criminal who uses a firearm in the commission of a crime.

In an effort to remedy this situation, I have today introduced legislation imposing a mandatory, nonsuspendable

prison sentence on anyone who uses a firearm in the commission of a felony. For the first offense there would be a minimum of a 5-year term; for a second offense there would be a minimum of a 10-year term. This sentence would be in addition to any other imposed for that felony, and could not be served concurrently with any other sentence.

In case of offenses governed by State law, this bill would create a new Federal crime, consisting of two elements: First, conviction of a felony by a State court; and second, use of a firearm in that felony. Administration of this law would be swift and easy. The deterrent effect would be great.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard the cries of those who want to register or even take guns away from law abiding citizens. Of course, experience shows that criminals will still be able to get guns. In rural areas, where police are few and far between, the result would be disastrous.

It is significant that the city with the strictest gun control laws in the country, New York City, also has one of the highest crime rates. This suggests that gun control laws only hurt law abiding people.

Mr. Speaker, the time has come for this country to deal realistically with this problem: We should strictly punish those who abuse firearms, and leave alone those who use them legally.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF U.S. DELEGATION, MEXICO - UNITED STATES INTERPARLIAMENTARY GROUP

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation:

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
March 13, 1972.

HON. CARL ALBERT,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Since I am unable, because of a conflict in my schedule, to attend the meeting of the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group in New Orleans on May 16th through 21st, I hereby tender my resignation for the express purpose of permitting you to select a successor that might be able to attend that important meeting.

I have discussed the matter with the Majority Leader, and I understand he is interested in such an opportunity.

Sincerely yours,

JEROME R. WALDIE,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBER OF U.S. DELEGATION, MEXICO - UNITED STATES INTERPARLIAMENTARY GROUP

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section I, Public Law 86-420, the Chair appoints as a member of the U.S. delegation of the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. Boggs) to fill an existing vacancy thereon.

TECHNICAL CORRECTION IN BILL FOR RELIEF OF DAVID J. CRUMB

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the Senate concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 67) to authorize the Secretary of the Senate to make a technical correction in the enrollment of the bill (S. 888) providing for the relief of David J. Crumb.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution as follows:

S. CON. RES. 67

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Secretary of the Senate, in the enrollment of the bill (S. 888), providing for the relief of David J. Crumb, is hereby authorized and directed to make the following correction: Strike out "5742(a)" and insert "5724a".

The Senate concurrent resolution was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

URGENT SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1972

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 1097) making certain urgent supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year 1972, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that it be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON)?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution as follows:

H. J. RES. 1097

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, namely:

CHAPTER I

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

MANPOWER ADMINISTRATION

FEDERAL UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS AND ALLOWANCES

For an additional amount for "Federal unemployment benefits and allowances," \$311,600,000.

ADVANCES TO THE EXTENDED UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION ACCOUNT

For making repayable advances to the extended unemployment compensation account in the Unemployment Trust Fund, as authorized by section 905(d) of the Social Security Act, as amended, \$600,000,000 to enable the Secretary of the Treasury to make such advances: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Treasury shall make such repayable advances at such times as he may determine, in consultation with the Secretary of Labor, that the amount in the extended unemployment compensation account is insufficient for the payments required by law to be paid therefrom to States.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION,
AND WELFARE

OFFICE OF EDUCATION

STUDENT LOAN INSURANCE FUND

For the Student Loan Insurance Fund, created by the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended, \$12,765,000, to remain available until expended.

CHAPTER II

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION
PAYMENT OF LOAN GUARANTIES

For payments required to be made as a consequence of loan guaranties made by the Interstate Commerce Commission under section 503 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended (49 U.S.C. 1233), \$28,000,000, together with such amounts as may be necessary to pay interest thereon.

CHAPTER III

CLAIMS AND JUDGMENTS

For payment of claims settled and determined by departments and agencies in accord with law and judgments rendered against the United States by the United States Court of Claims and United States district courts, as set forth in House Document Numbered 92-262. Ninety-second Congress, \$5,111,059, together with such amounts as may be necessary to pay interest (as and when specified in such judgments or provided by law) and such additional sums due to increases in rates of exchange as may be necessary to pay claims in foreign currency: *Provided*, That no judgment herein appropriated for shall be paid until it shall become final and conclusive against the United States by failure of the parties to appeal or otherwise: *Provided further*, That unless otherwise specifically required by law or by judgment, payment of interest wherever appropriated for herein shall not continue for more than thirty days after the date of approval of the Act.

CHAPTER IV

GENERAL PROVISION

No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year unless expressly so provided herein.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, this is an urgent supplemental appropriation measure for the fiscal year 1972. About \$957 million is involved. The details are in the hearings and report of the committee, but briefly, every item involves expenditures required as a result of existing laws.

The amount \$311,600,000 is required to make payments for unemployment compensation for ex-Federal employees and ex-servicemen.

The sum of \$600,000,000 is required as a result of legislation passed by the Congress in 1970 and in 1971, authorizing a program of extended unemployment compensation payments.

Mr. Speaker, I would think that as a practical matter, in the circumstances there is nothing we can do other than to approve this legislation. The urgency of the matter arises from the information available to the committee that funds for certain payments will be exhausted about the 20th of this month.

There is also a provision in the resolution to provide \$12,765,000 to take care of defaulted payments of students whose loans have been guaranteed to various lending institutions.

In addition, there are certain claims and judgments against the Federal Gov-

ernment that have been settled and determined, and this resolution provides about \$5.1 million for them.

There is another item of \$28,000,000 involving a guaranteed loan to the Reading Railroad Co. that is in default.

Mr. Speaker, there are many other supplemental requests pending before the Committee on Appropriations, but it has been agreed that we will undertake to hold this urgent supplemental measure to these few items in order that early action can be taken and the deadline of about March 20 for final passage of the resolution achieved.

The subcommittees handling the main parts of this legislation are headed by Mr. Flood of Pennsylvania, and Mr. McFall of California.

Unless there are questions, I shall yield back the balance of my time, but I would think that perhaps some of the members of the subcommittees directly concerned might like to make further explanation of the action which we are now requesting of the House.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend, I include summary comments from the report of the committee on the measure. Additional details are in the report and in the printed hearings:

The total sum of \$957,476,059 is recommended for a handful of proposals as shown in the table at the end of this report. They involve items lifted from pending supplemental budget requests for fiscal 1972 being considered in connection with the Second Supplemental Appropriation Bill, 1972, which the Committee plans to report not long after the Easter recess break. Action on that bill will not be timely enough to meet the pressing needs represented by this joint resolution.

Specifically, \$911.6 million in the joint resolution relates to unemployment compensation payments mandated under basic laws—\$311.6 million relating to former Federal civilian employees and ex-servicemen, and \$600 million relating to estimated fiscal 1972 payments to the States (as repayable advances) for extended unemployment benefits under Public Laws 91-373 and 92-224. Under the first item, funds for payments are expected to be exhausted later this month. As to the second item, the other body has twice attached the proposals to other bills and the last time, which was just recently, it was agreed on all sides that the matter ought to be disposed of by mid-March.

\$12,765,000 is for additional payments for insured student loans in default where the Government has the legal obligation to make good on the loans.

\$28,000,000 is to make good on a defaulted Reading Company railroad loan guaranteed by the Government under the Interstate Commerce Act. Interest is running on the obligation.

\$5,111,059 relates to sundry claims and judgments settled or rendered against the Government. Interest runs on some of these items.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MICHEL).

Mr. MICHEL. I thank the Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the chairman of our full committee has certainly explained the need for this urgent supplemental concisely.

I will only say further that Members will recall the emergency unemployment legislation which was passed by this Congress late last year provided for pay-

ments out of the general fund, and that now aggregates something like \$341 million in this particular bill. That will satisfy only those claims that will be paid during the balance of this fiscal year 1972, but under the terms of the legislation, there can be filings until the last day of the fiscal year and payments will still run over into fiscal year 1973. So we are going to have to have more money in fiscal 1973 to satisfy the balance of those claims. Estimates are currently in the range of \$120 million, but I wouldn't be surprised if it ends up being double or triple that amount.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I think it should be noted that with respect to education loans, we now have some 5 million of them in being, aggregating some \$4.5 billion, \$1.6 billion of which is in a repayment status, and the default rate now is estimated to be about 3½ percent. But I would remind the Members who might be too critical that under the NDEA loan program the default rate was at 6 percent. So I think, as the chairman indicates, we have no alternative but to ante up the funds that have been requested in this supplemental and support the House joint resolution.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the necessary number of words.

Mr. Speaker, from what I have heard from the gentleman from Texas and the gentleman from Illinois, apparently we are seeing only the tip of the default iceberg with respect to student loans. Apparently, we can expect to see many, many more millions requested in order to take care of guarantees to the banks. Is that about right?

Mr. MAHON. I would observe that the loans which have been made are very large indeed, and while the amount in the pending resolution, \$12,765,000, is considerable, it is a minor fraction of the total of the loans insured. We may be seeing the tip of the iceberg to some extent. We cannot foresee how big the defaults may eventually become, but they may be very considerable.

Of course, we are here reaping what the Congress has sown in an effort to encourage education. This is not a matter which originated in the Committee on Appropriations. It came as a result of basic legislation enacted by the Congress as, of course, my friend knows.

Mr. GROSS. Of course, what we are picking up here is the financing of spending measures that the House has approved. We often hear around here about uncontrollable expenditures, and for that reason we have to do these things. There is no such thing as an uncontrollable expenditure on the part of the Federal Government. It is up to the House of Representatives and the other body to control these expenditures in the first place. There is no such thing as an uncontrollable.

There is talk about the interest on the Federal debt, which this year will go above \$450 billion, and the interest on the debt will climb to \$22.7 billion. It is said this is uncontrollable. It is controllable if the House and the other body have the will to cut spending and reduce the debt. That is the way it ought to be.

Here we are with deficiency appropriations picking up the bill for expenditures in many instances that ought not to have been made. Somewhere along the line we are going to have to use the ax on expenditures and stop this business of kidding ourselves and the public that expenditures are uncontrollable.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say to the gentleman from Iowa that there is a great deal of logic in what he has said about so-called uncontrollable expenditures and that we are inevitably going to have to face up to this situation. As the gentleman says, there are many expenditures that are relatively uncontrollable under existing law, but the Congress has the power of the purse and the power of legislation, so actually there are very few really uncontrollable expenditures. Congress has the power to deauthorize what it has previously authorized.

Mr. GROSS. There are no uncontrollables. The House and the other body, the Congress of the United States can control these expenditures if they want to do it.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, in the first place, with respect to the unemployment compensation expenditures—and I have made the point they are as the gentleman indicated, uncontrollable, but they are uncontrollable only to the extent Congress itself does or does not act one way or the other. We have the laws on the books, and we are obliged to satisfy the laws in keeping with the formulas we have established in the legislative committees. I do not particularly like them but there is an obligation that we have to meet.

Mr. GROSS. The laws are on the books, because Congress approved the laws. There is where the fault begins, and it ends with more and more deficiency appropriations like this.

Mr. MICHEL. The gentleman is correct. I cannot fault him on that. Let me say further that we are getting more and more students now taking advantage of the loan program in the field of vocational training, which lasts for only 1 or 2 years. There is an increase in the rate of default among those students who have been getting just enough education to get a job and being forced to repay the loan early, and that is causing a problem.

We're also finding that some students have been encouraged to take bankruptcy as a means of escaping their obligations. That is taking place with respect to our adult population, and it pervades throughout the lower strata of youth who are taking a cue from their elders and declaring bankruptcy.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Boggs). The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. Gross was

allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. GROSS. Who is encouraging the students to take bankruptcy?

Mr. MICHEL. If the gentleman will yield, in some particular areas around the country we have these legal aid societies advising the young people that this is one way of getting out of their obligations to the Federal Government. It wrangles me no end because the taxpayer is getting it in the neck both ways, because we are federally funding those legal services around the country. All the fears I expressed when these free legal services were authorized are certainly being borne out. It is certainly a blot on the program—both programs for that matter.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Speaker, in connection with what was just being said, I may say to my friend, the gentleman from Iowa, that I raised this question at our hearing before our subcommittee, because all of a sudden, to my utter amazement—and I am sure that of the gentleman—we started getting statements about bankruptcy—bankruptcy—bankruptcy. We were talking about student loan defaults, and someone mentioned bankruptcy as one of the reasons why some of these loans are in default. This is what is happening. We have now developed a class of 19- to 20-year-old bankrupts.

When I was that age I could hardly spell "bankruptcy." Now there is something going on somewhere, somewhere, with somebody advising these students who have borrowed money or who have guaranteed loans, and they are now, at 19 and 20 years of age, going bankrupt. This is hard to believe, but this is actually the case, so we are advised.

We did not examine this in any great depth. We conducted no examination. But we have asked the Department, "For heaven's sake, would you look into this as soon as you can and tell us more about this new breed of 19- and 20-year-old bankrupts."

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. They are really getting training early these days in high finance.

Mr. FLOOD. I cannot imagine anybody saying it better than I, but the gentleman just did.

Mr. GROSS. Yes, they are really getting their bankruptcy training early, and I guess that is a symptom of these times.

Mr. FLOOD. There is also another question, I might say to my friend. Let me ask this: Are these flinthearted, steely-eyed bankers of tradition exercising all their acumen before they grant the loans? Are they advising and consulting before the loans are granted? Are they participating in this?

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield further, I am not a banker, but I see a banker sitting in the first row, the gentleman from Ohio. I do not know whether it could be said that he is steely eyed.

Mr. FLOOD. Take a look and see.

The gentleman understands what I mean. Are the bankers and lenders doing their share? Is everybody pulling his weight?

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I should like to ask the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee a question.

In this bill I see an appropriation of \$28 million to pay for the default of the loan of the Reading Railroad Co. under section 5 of title V of the Interstate Commerce Act. I should like to inquire as to whether this authority in the ICC is unlimited? Has the Congress lost its authority or its capacity to limit the loan guarantee power of the ICC?

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VANIK. I yield to the distinguished chairman.

Mr. MAHON. Congress has not lost its control over the purse or its legislative authority with respect to guaranteed loans. The Congress, in 1958, passed legislation—which became part V of the ICC Act—authorizing the Interstate Commerce Commission to guarantee certain loans.

I have before me the hearings on this resolution which contain a list of the outstanding loans, about nine of them, totaling about \$89 million. The one in default, of course, is for \$28 million to the Reading Co.

I might add that it is my understanding that this listing constitutes the maximum remaining potential liability of the Government under this program. The authority for the ICC to make new guarantees under the 1958 act has terminated.

Mr. VANIK. I thank the distinguished chairman.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Speaker, if I may have the attention of the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. Gross), I believe he was referring to me a moment ago. I would say to him that the bank in which I am a director has made some guaranteed student loans, only to local boys and girls of good reputation and whose parents have a good reputation, and up to now we do not have any in default.

I am amazed and surprised to hear the statement of the gentleman from Pennsylvania. I believe it is shocking and it should be looked into.

In connection with something else the gentleman said, he said anything is controllable. I am inclined to agree with him, so far as Congress appropriating the money is concerned.

In fact, anything is possible. I will give an example. I was at a dinner party a couple of nights ago. There were a couple of Cabinet members from this administration there. They were needling the Democrats about the terrible situation we are in, with our plethora of candidates, and with Mr. Wallace the front-runner, apparently, in Florida, and they said, "Look what a situation you Democrats are in. Here is Wallace going to the convention with a couple of hundred delegates, and he can be nothing but

trouble, because there is no way that you Democrats could have him on the ticket."

I said, "What do you mean, there is no way? Everything is possible." I said, "If they want to nominate me, I will take Mr. Wallace for Vice President."

One of the Cabinet members said, "Would you run with Wallace?"

I said, "Why not? Nixon ran with AGNEW, did he not?"

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Speaker, the question was asked by one of the Members here as to where these young people acquired at the age of 19 or 20 the experience of bankruptcy.

I suggest it is not a very difficult thing to acquire that experience under this administration, and what we are picking up in this bill are the consequences of an economic policy of an administration that has been in existence for 3 years and that has plunged a good part of this country into bankruptcy and into default on loans. Until such time as this administration comes up with a cogent and coherent economic policy it makes no sense to blame these failures on young students.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALDIE. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Would the gentleman prefer that some of these young men who will get these loans go back to Vietnam as they did under the past administration or have the whole thing open up as we had in the past, or would he like us to go through the transition from war to peace as we are doing now? Or do you want to go back to a period of peace to war?

Mr. WALDIE. I prefer that the administration provide for these young people the job opportunities that a Democratic administration provided for you and for me. This bill does nothing but deal with the failures of economic policies of this administration which has as its keystone policy, putting people out of work.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. WALDIE. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CEDERBERG. The unemployment rate at the present time is right where it was during the Kennedy administration, which the gentleman supported at that time. When we did send all of our boys over to Vietnam and when we had a high draft call, it went down, of course. Now it is down lower than it was, but we are back to the pre-Kennedy administration days in the area of unemployment. We can discuss that all we want to—

Mr. WALDIE. We do not have to.

Mr. CEDERBERG. But that does not make any kind of a contribution to what we are talking about here.

Mr. WALDIE. We do not have to discuss it any further, because I will not yield further. But you are dead right that the unemployment rate was the same as today under Nixon when Kennedy took over from Eisenhower, the last Republican administration, and when we had a similar high rate of unemploy-

ment. That is what we are dealing with now. What we are dealing with here are the consequences of that absurd economic policy which President Nixon has foisted on the American people. This is a consequence of these deficiencies, with its effect on the young people who graduate from college and find no jobs available.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge quick approval of the \$28 million, plus interest to date of payment, to repay a Government-guaranteed loan made to the Reading Co. With interest on the loan accruing at \$5,000 a day, time is of the essence. If by some miracle we could pay this loan by tomorrow, the interest costs alone would be almost \$1.3 million. A delay in payment until the end of June will add another \$500,000 to the bill.

At a time when we are all struggling to put our economic house in order, it is my hope that the House will promptly approve this request and that the Senate will do likewise. Further delay will only result in needless wastes of the American taxpayers' money.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the joint resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. Boggs). The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 365, nays 16, not voting 50, as follows:

[Roll No. 73]

YEAS—365

Abblitt	Boland	Celler
Abernethy	Bolling	Chamberlain
Abzug	Bow	Chappell
Adams	Brademas	Clancy
Addabbo	Brasco	Clark
Alexander	Bray	Clausen,
Anderson,	Brinkley	Don H.
Calif.	Brooks	Clawson, Del
Anderson, Ill.	Brozman	Clay
Anderson,	Brown, Mich.	Collier
Tenn.	Brown, Ohio	Collins, Ill.
Andrews	Broyhill, N.C.	Conable
Annuizio	Broyhill, Va.	Conyers
Ashley	Buchanan	Corman
Aspin	Burke, Fla.	Coughlin
Barrett	Burke, Mass.	Culver
Begich	Burleson, Tex.	Curlin
Belcher	Burlison, Mo.	Daniel, Va.
Bell	Burton	Daniels, N.J.
Bennett	Byrne, Pa.	Danielson
Bergland	Byrnes, Wis.	Davis, Ga.
Betts	Byron	Davis, S.C.
Bevill	Cabell	Davis, Wis.
Blaggi	Carey, N.Y.	de la Garza
Biester	Carney	Delaney
Blanton	Carter	Dellenback
Blatnik	Casey, Tex.	Denholm
Boggs	Cederberg	

Dennis	Keating	Roe
Dent	Kee	Rogers
Derwinski	Keith	Rooney, N.Y.
Dickinson	Kemp	Rooney, Pa.
Diggs	Kluczynski	Rosenthal
Dingell	Koch	Rostenkowski
Donohue	Kuykendall	Roush
Dorn	Kyl	Rousselot
Dow	Kyros	Roy
Downing	Latta	Roybal
Drinan	Leggett	Runnels
Dulski	Lennon	Ruppe
Duncan	Lent	Ruth
du Pont	Link	Ryan
Edmondson	Lloyd	St Germain
Edwards, Ala.	Long, Md.	Sandman
Edwards, Calif.	Lujan	Sarbanes
Eilberg	McClary	Satterfield
Erlenborn	McCloskey	Saylor
Esch	McClure	Scherle
Eshleman	McCollister	Schneebeli
Evans, Colo.	McCormack	Schwengel
Evins, Tenn.	McCulloch	Scott
Fascell	McDade	Sebelius
Findley	McEwen	Seiberling
Fish	McFall	Shipley
Flood	McKay	Shoup
Flowers	McKevitt	Shriver
Flynt	McKinney	Sikes
Foley	McMillan	Sisk
Ford, Gerald R.	Madden	Skubitz
Ford,	Mahon	Slack
William D.	Mailliard	Smith, Calif.
Forsythe	Mallary	Smith, Iowa
Fountain	Mann	Smith, N.Y.
Fraser	Martin	Snyder
Frelinghuysen	Mathias, Calif.	Spence
Frenzel	Matsunaga	Springer
Frey	Mayne	Staggers
Fulton	Mazzoli	Stanton,
Fuqua	Meeds	J. William
Gallagher	Melcher	Stanton,
Garmatz	Metcalfe	James V.
Gettys	Michel	Steed
Gialmo	Mikva	Steele
Gibbons	Miller, Calif.	Steiger, Ariz.
Goldwater	Miller, Ohio	Steiger, Wis.
Gonzalez	Mills, Ark.	Stokes
Goodling	Mills, Md.	Stratton
Grasso	Minish	Stuckey
Gray	Minshall	Sullivan
Green, Pa.	Mizell	Symington
Griffin	Molohan	Talcott
Grover	Monagan	Taylor
Gubser	Moorhead	Teague, Calif.
Gude	Morgan	Teague, Tex.
Hagan	Morse	Terry
Haley	Mosher	Thompson, Ga.
Halpern	Murphy, Ill.	Thompson, N.J.
Hamilton	Murphy, N.Y.	Thomson, Wis.
Hammer-	Myers	Thone
schmidt	Natcher	Tiernan
Hanley	Nedzi	Vander Jagt
Hanna	Nichols	Vanik
Hansen, Idaho	Nix	Veysey
Hansen, Wash.	Obey	Vigorito
Harrington	O'Konski	Waggonner
Harsha	O'Neill	Waldie
Harvey	Passman	Wampler
Hastings	Patman	Ware
Hathaway	Patten	Whalen
Hawkins	Pepper	Whalley
Hays	Perkins	White
Hechler, W. Va.	Pettis	Whitehurst
Heckler, Mass.	Peyser	Whitten
Heinz	Pickle	Widnall
Helstoski	Pike	Wiggins
Henderson	Pirnie	Williams
Hicks, Mass.	Poage	Wilson, Bob
Hicks, Wash.	Podell	Wilson,
Hill	Poff	Charles H.
Hogan	Preyer, N.C.	Winn
Horton	Price, Ill.	Wolff
Hosmer	Purcell	Wright
Howard	Quie	Wyatt
Hungate	Quillen	Wydler
Hunt	Rallsback	Wylie
Hutchinson	Randall	Wyman
Ichord	Rangel	Yates
Johnson, Calif.	Rees	Yatron
Johnson, Pa.	Reid	Zion
Jonas	Reuss	Zwack
Jones, N.C.	Rhodes	Young, Fla.
Jones, Tenn.	Roberts	Young, Tex.
Karsh	Robinson, Va.	Zablocki
Kastenmeyer	Robinson, N.Y.	
Kazen	Rodino	

NAYS—16

Archer	Crane	Price, Tex.
Baker	Devine	Rarick
Camp	Gross	Roncalio
Cleveland	Hall	Schmitz
Collins, Tex.	Landgrebe	
Colmer	Mathis, Ga.	

NOT VOTING—50

Abourezk	Galifianakis	Mitchell
Arends	Gaydos	Montgomery
Ashbrook	Green, Oreg.	Moss
Aspinall	Griffiths	Nelsen
Badillo	Hébert	O'Hara
Baring	Hollifield	Pelly
Bingham	Hull	Powell
Blackburn	Jacobs	Pryor, Ark.
Broomfield	Jarman	Pucinski
Caffery	Jones, Ala.	Riegle
Chisholm	King	Scheuer
Cotter	Landrum	Stephens
Dellums	Long, La.	Stubblefield
Dowdy	McDonald,	Udall
Dwyer	Mich.	Ullman
Eckhardt	Macdonald,	Van Deerlin
Edwards, La.	Mass.	
Fisher	Mink	

So the joint resolution was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Arends.
 Mr. Stubblefield with Mr. Broomfield.
 Mr. Hollifield with Mr. King.
 Mr. Hull with Mrs. Dwyer.
 Mr. Aspinall with Mr. Pelly.
 Mr. Fisher with Mr. Nelsen.
 Mr. Van Deerlin with Mr. McDonald of Michigan.
 Mr. Jones of Alabama with Mr. Ashbrook.
 Mr. Caffery with Mr. Blackburn.
 Mrs. Green of Oregon with Mr. Riegle.
 Mr. O'Hara with Mr. Powell.
 Mr. Cotton with Mr. Dellums.
 Mr. Stephens with Mr. Udall.
 Mr. Barring with Mr. Badillo.
 Mrs. Chisholm with Mr. Eckhardt.
 Mr. Gaydos with Mrs. Griffiths.
 Mr. Pucinski with Mr. Pryor of Arkansas.
 Mr. Macdonald of Massachusetts with Mr. Long of Louisiana.
 Mr. Landrum with Mr. Jacobs.
 Mr. Jarman with Mr. Dowdy.
 Mr. Galifianakis with Mr. Mitchell.
 Mr. Montgomery with Mr. Moss.
 Mr. Bingham with Mr. Abourezk.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include extraneous matter, and I ask unanimous consent that all Members be permitted to revise and extend their remarks on the joint resolution just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON RULES TO FILE REPORTS

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I ask unanimous consent that that committee may have until midnight tonight to file reports on two bills.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING PREPARATION OF OFFICIAL DUPLICATES OF S. 2097

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate

consideration of the Senate concurred resolution (S. Con. Res. 68) to authorize the preparation of official duplicates of S. 2097.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman the meaning of his request?

Mr. STAGGERS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to yield to my friend from West Virginia.

Mr. STAGGERS. I will say to the gentleman that the House and Senate passed a bill to establish a special action office for drug abuse prevention and directing the President to concentrate the resources of the Nation against the problem of drug abuse and we had to have a conference with the Senate on it. During the conference the Senate lost the official papers.

Mr. GROSS. The Senate did what? Will the gentleman please repeat that statement?

Mr. STAGGERS. I will be happy to. I will say that the Senate or some of the people working for the Senate committee lost the official papers, and we have to pass this concurrent resolution in order to have the papers reprinted.

Mr. GROSS. As one gentleman suggests, I have heard everything now. I do not believe that in my years in Congress I have ever heard of the papers being completely lost. Is there any indication of where the Senate papers were lost?

Mr. STAGGERS. I have not heard anything about it. All they say in the Senate that they were lost and they need to have a concurrent resolution passed before we can bring the conference report to the floor.

Mr. GROSS. Do you suppose it would be of any benefit if we appropriated a little money on the House side to supply the Members of the other body and their staffs with seeing-eye dogs or a reward or something of that kind?

Mr. STAGGERS. I am not sure, sir, whether that would be helpful or not, but it really is the first time I have ever heard of anything like this. However, this is the only way we can proceed.

Mr. GROSS. Or perhaps a course in memory training.

Mr. SPRINGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SPRINGER. I want to say to my distinguished colleague from Iowa that this is the second bill we have brought up here in the last week and a half. I know it pleases my colleague that this does not cost a single cent.

Mr. GROSS. That is helpful, but it still does not answer the question as to how papers can disappear as readily and as easily as they apparently did in this case.

However, I thank the gentleman for his observation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution as follows:

S. CON. RES. 68

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives are authorized and directed to prepare and sign official duplicates of the conference papers of the bill (S. 2097) to establish a Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention and to concentrate the resources of the Nation against the problem of drug abuse.

The Senate concurrent resolution was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 18, GRANTS TO RADIO FREE EUROPE AND RADIO LIBERTY

Mr. FASCELL submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (S. 18) to amend the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948 to provide assistance to Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 92-914)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 18) to amend the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948 to provide assistance to Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the text of the bill and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following:

That the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948 is amended by inserting after section 702 the following new section:

"AUTHORIZATION FOR GRANTS TO RADIO FREE EUROPE AND RADIO LIBERTY

"Sec. 703. There are authorized to be appropriated to the Department \$36,000,000 for fiscal year 1972 to provide grants, under such terms and conditions as the Secretary considers appropriate, to Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty. Except for funds appropriated under this section, no funds appropriated after the date of enactment of this section for any fiscal year, under this or any other provision of law, may be made available to or for the use of Radio Free Europe or Radio Liberty."

And the House agree to the same.

That the House recede from its amendment to the title of the bill.

THOMAS E. MORGAN,
 CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI,
 WAYNE L. HAYS,
 DANTE FASCELL,
 W. S. MAILLIARD,
 PETER H. B. FRELINGHUYSEN,
 WM. BROOMFIELD,
Managers on the Part of the House.

FRANK CHURCH,
 STUART SYMINGTON,
 GEORGE D. AIKEN,
 CLIFFORD P. CASE,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JOINT EXPLANATORY STATEMENT OF THE COMMITTEE OF CONFERENCE

The managers on the part of the House and the Senate at the conference on the

disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 18) to amend the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948 to provide assistance to Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty, submit the following joint statement to the House and the Senate in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the managers and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Conferees were in disagreement as to whether the Radios should be continued in operation beyond this fiscal year.

The House Conferees felt strongly that the Radios should not have their activities terminate precipitously and without further study as to whether they serve the national interest. Thus, the House Conferees were insistent that the Radios be authorized for two years during which time their utility could be studied.

The Senate Conferees were adamant in their belief that the Radios should be continued only for the balance of the current fiscal year leaving the future of the Radios to determination by the Congress in action taken before the beginning of fiscal year 1973. Some felt that the future of the Radios should be considered within the context of periodic State Department or USIA authorization legislation.

The Conferees resolved their differences by agreeing to legislation which will continue the programs at the authorized rate of \$36 million only for the balance of the current fiscal year with the clear understanding, however, that further legislation will be considered before the end of this fiscal year.

It is, of course, not possible to predict what action the Congress may take. However, the Conferees were agreed that should there be a decision to terminate the activities of the Radios, fairness and equity require that funds would need to be made available for orderly termination. They also agreed that this reference to termination is not to be construed as a prejudgment as to continuation of the programs, their expansion, their contraction, or other means of financing the Radios.

THOMAS E. MORGAN,
CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI,
WAYNE L. HAYS,
DANTE FASCELL,
W. S. MAILLIARD,
PETER H. B. FRELINGHUYSEN,
WM. BROOMFIELD,
Managers on the Part of the House.

FRANK CHURCH,
STUART SYMINGTON,
GEORGE D. AIKEN,
CLIFFORD P. CASE,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

FOREIGN AID—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 92-190)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Today I am transmitting to the Congress legislation which would authorize funding for my foreign aid proposals for the coming fiscal year. This draft bill, which is entitled the Foreign Assistance Act of 1972, also contains provisions to make our military assistance more effective.

As I have often indicated, our foreign assistance programs are a central ele-

ment in our foreign policy for the 1970s. For it is as dangerous for this Nation to ignore the problems of poverty and hunger and the need for security in other nations as it is to ignore our own domestic needs.

The Congress, acting after two-thirds of the current fiscal year had already passed, drastically reduced my foreign assistance requests for fiscal year 1972. In my judgment, the amounts appropriated for both security and development assistance in fiscal year 1972 are below the minimum level required to attain our foreign policy and national security goals. These reductions have created difficult problems in essential programs and in our relations with several countries. A repetition of these reductions and delays in 1973 would call into serious question the firmness of our commitments abroad and could have a destabilizing effect at a time when calm confidence in our support and perseverance will be critically needed. I therefore urge the Congress to act promptly to authorize and appropriate the full amounts requested for foreign assistance in fiscal year 1973.

In forwarding the Foreign Assistance Act of 1972, I would also underscore the points I made in my message to the Congress on April 21, 1971. In that message I addressed the need for fundamental reform of foreign assistance and recommended a major reorganization of these programs. I hope that the Congress will give closer consideration to these proposals in this session, and that together we can develop the most effective program possible, one that truly merits the broad bipartisan support that foreign aid has enjoyed in the past.

SECURITY ASSISTANCE

As I pointed out in my annual Report to the Congress on Foreign Policy last month: "Security assistance is a cornerstone of our foreign policy and of Free World security . . ." We live today in a period of transition in world affairs, in a time in which the United States is taking bold initiatives to build a new structure of peace, while asking our friends and allies to assume a greater responsibility for their own defense.

As we begin to make adjustments in our international role, it is especially critical that we maintain a firm U.S. commitment to an adequate level of security assistance. For without such adequate levels, our friends and allies will lack the confidence required for successful international cooperation in an era of negotiations. And without adequate security assistance, we cannot safely reduce our military presence abroad.

I am therefore requesting authorizations for security assistance programs totaling \$2,151 million in fiscal year 1973: \$780 million for grant military assistance, \$527 million for military credit sales, and \$844 million for security supporting assistance, of which an estimated \$50 million is intended for Israel.

NARCOTICS CONTROL

I am requesting that a separate appropriation of \$42.5 million be authorized for the support of international narcotics control activities. Control of illicit drug

production and trafficking is one of the highest priorities of my Administration. I believe the authorization and appropriation of funds specifically for this purpose is essential to clearly demonstrate the determination of the Administration, the Congress, and the American people to overcome this serious menace.

SOUTH ASIA RELIEF AND RECONSTRUCTION ASSISTANCE

I am also proposing the authorization of \$100 million in fiscal year 1973 for refugee relief and humanitarian assistance in South Asia. This sum would be in addition to the \$200 million appropriated for this purpose for the current fiscal year.

The damage and destruction growing out of the war between India and Pakistan has truly been immense. We have indicated our willingness to work with other donors under the auspices of the United Nations to provide relief and rehabilitation to those in need.

The Secretary General of the United Nations has issued an assessment of these needs and a special appeal for support. We have already made an initial contribution to this effort and will continue to contribute in the light of the efforts of others and further assessments of need. The \$100 million which I am requesting would enable us to continue to participate generously, along with other nations, in this important work.

RICHARD NIXON.
THE WHITE HOUSE, March 14, 1972.

NATIONAL PROGRESS IN AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ACTIVITIES DURING 1971—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Science and Astronautics:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to transmit herewith a report of our national progress in aeronautics and space activities during 1971.

This report shows that we have made forward strides toward each of the six objectives which I set forth for a balanced space program in my statement of March 7, 1970.

Aided by the improvements we have made in mobility, our explorers on the moon last summer produced new, exciting and useful evidence on the structure and origin of the moon. Several phenomena which they uncovered are now under study. Our unmanned nearby observation of Mars is similarly valuable and significant for the advancement of science.

During 1971, we gave added emphasis to aeronautics activities which contribute substantially to improved travel conditions, safety and security, and we gained increasing recognition that space and aeronautical research serves in many ways to keep us in the forefront of man's technological achievements.

There can be little doubt that the investments we are now making in explorations of the unknown are but a pre-

lude to the accomplishments of mankind in future generations.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, March 14, 1972.

SERIOUS CHARGES AGAINST THE DALLAS OFFICE OF THE WAR ON POVERTY

(Mr. CABELL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CABELL. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty to report that over the past 10 days the Dallas Office of the War on Poverty has come under serious charges from both local newspapers that threaten to curtail or to completely eliminate future conduct of this program.

Today, the executive board of the Dallas Community Action is hopelessly divided and incapable of executive action.

The executive director of DCA has resigned under fire from both factions and for more than 2 months agreement on a successor has been impossible.

Over the past 2 years many responsible individuals both from the public sector and from the poverty group have left the program because of their inability to achieve progress or harmony, and

An increasing number of DCA programs are under investigation for a variety of violations, including misuse of funds, "hot checks," conflict of interest and many other obvious violations of program guidelines.

Currently at least three investigations are underway, including those by the local DCA office, the regional OEO office and the Dallas District Attorney. Only recently the DCA credit union was evaluated by the National Credit Union Administration and problems of growth and participation, of improper loan documentation, and of improper loan approval were uncovered.

In addition to serious discrepancies in the conduct of the program's credit union, newspaper investigation has disclosed that almost \$1,000 in hot checks have turned up following the expenditure of \$5,242 during 6 months by a former member of the DCA youth program who is now in California and refuses to answer questions, that over \$4,000 was spent by the same youth program for a Southern Christian Leadership Conference film showing that was available for \$250 and that serious questions existed on financial decisions made by individuals with authority to rule on budgets of their own departments including their own salaries.

These charges are a bitter disappointment to those of us who have helped originate this program and who know the great need that it can fill when properly administered. I am aware that any charge against the Dallas DCA must be balanced by sincere praise for its accomplishments over the years, for the sense of hope that it has given many of our disadvantaged, and in recognition of the selfless devotion to its ideal by so many hard-working individuals, some of whom have retired from it frustrated and disillusioned.

I believe that a prompt, objective and thorough review of the entire program is needed to save it from itself. However, I sincerely question the effectiveness of the current studies. I hope that discrepancies uncovered will fall short of the criminality that would warrant action by the district attorney.

Nevertheless, I feel any investigation by either local or regional OEO officials would be meaningless.

The present OEO regional director, Samuel R. Martinez, has shown no more inclination to deal firmly with discovered violations than his predecessor James W. Griffith.

For almost 4 months I have been waiting upon the OEO office for an explanation of what I felt were questionable practices in local operations. Though my office has been repeatedly told the matters were under investigation, no further word has been given and, to this date, the new regional director has excused his inaction on this matter by protesting difficulties of a move from Denver to Dallas which, as near as I can learn, has now occupied him for almost 2 months.

In the meantime, Mr. Martinez has granted employees found guilty of conflict of interest violations 12 months of freedom to continue an illegal position that threatened them last December with a loss of \$6 million in Federal funds.

Lacking confidence in either the local board or its staff, and in the new regional director and his staff, the only recourse, it seems to me, is full-scale review of the program from the Washington OEO office. However, while such reviews in the past have brought firmer guidelines, the ability of the Washington office to impose discipline at the local level leaves much to be desired.

It may be that an entirely independent financial audit must be ordered by Congress of all questionable OEO projects or that Congress itself must investigate the program.

The really sad commentary on this whole mess is that two segments of our citizenry are suffering irreparable losses.

The taxpaying citizens, who are willing for their tax dollars to be used for assisting those less fortunate than themselves are seeing their hard-earned dollars going down the drain. Most importantly, the disadvantaged, for whom these taxes are levied, are not being assisted. They are frustrated and are losing confidence in their Congress for not maintaining better oversight over these programs initiated ostensibly for assistance to those disadvantaged.

If OEO is unable to clean its own house at all levels, then it is the responsibility of this Congress to make certain its intent is obeyed or the program be abandoned.

SOME IMPORTANT FACTS

(Mr. NIX asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, recent public criticism about U.S. policy toward South Africa and the Portuguese colonies in

Africa, as reflected in our votes in the United Nations, is understandable. It should not, however, obscure the sustained efforts the United States has made, and is making, to assist in the development efforts of countries we often refer to as Sub-Sahara Africa.

The transition in Africa from a colonial status to independence has not always been smooth and peaceful. Each of the newly independent countries is busily engaged in molding its own political forms in a manner compatible with its internal situation. There is little that the United States can, or should, do to direct the political patterns of these governments.

In each of these countries there are, however, common-core problems that have engaged our resources, such as food production, basic health and family planning services, public administration, and transforming their educational systems to respond to the requirements of rapidly changing societies. Much of U.S. economic aid has gone into these sectors.

The growing role and interest of the United States in Africa is reflected in AID support and commitment to a number of regional organizations in Africa. These organizations each have a solid base of support in Africa and are playing an increasingly effective and important role in the development activities of their member states. The four principal organizations include the African Development Bank, the U.N. Economic Commission for Africa, the Entente Fund, and the East African Community. In addition to these organizations, there are a number of other regional organizations with specialized interests in Africa that AID assists through grants to support elements of their programs.

About one-third of the U.S. program to Africa, including technical assistance projects, are devoted to these regional activities to promote greater cooperation in undertaking development activities which are not viable on a single country basis or which can be accomplished more advantageously by multicountry cooperation. It is through such programs that we have promoted activities to increase interstate communication, to enlarge the numbers of trained personnel and to attack the problems of agricultural production and marketing that will help increase individual incomes and improve the quality of life of the population as a whole.

The most recent figures for 1970 indicate that total assistance to Africa from the non-Communist nations amounted to more than \$1.7 billion of which more than \$300 million—or 19 percent—came from the United States. This latter figure includes programs under the Agency for International Development as well as those carried out under the Food for Peace legislation and the Peace Corps. The United Nations Development Program to which the United States is the principal contributor has spent more than 37 percent of its funds in Africa.

Since 1949 total U.S. bilateral assistance to Sub-Sahara Africa under various programs has amounted to about \$2.6 billion.

WE TRIED HARDER

(Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, March 4, 1972, Paul Harvey News, a radio show carried nationally by the American Broadcasting Co., commented on a situation in the Midwest which many of us in Congress have been aware of for some time. It is a topic which has often been the subject of bitter debate both here in the Halls of Congress as well as in some of the finer establishments in the major cities of our land. Much has been said and much has been written about this, Mr. Speaker, but when all the evidence is in, there can be little doubt as to the outcome of this argument.

It was well summarized in the recent statement by Paul Harvey on the ABC radio network when he proclaimed that Chicago is No. 1. For when Paul Harvey in his patented delivery declared that "Chicago, for generations our Nation's 'second city,' has become No. 1" even the remaining doubters on that fabled isle in the Hudson were forced to stand up and take notice. His commentary is so convincing and his facts so clearly conclusive, that I would like to insert the text of his remarks in the RECORD for all my colleagues from Fun City to take due note of.

Chicago, for generations our nation's "second city", has become number one.

The evidence is irrefutable. The "reasons why" should be fun to compute.

The busiest freeway in the world is the one connecting Chicago with its airport and points beyond. 240,000 cars per day.

And Chicago's airport is the busiest commercial airport in the world, $\frac{2}{3}$ of a million flights in or out last year.

And the busiest streetcorner in the world is State and Madison.

While New York's population has been stagnating for two decades, Chicago's telephone directory became the fattest in the nation.

And Sears Roebuck is right now putting the upper floors of the tallest office building in the world—in Chicago.

Chicago already had the tallest apartment building, the tallest bank, the biggest underground garage.

Chicago's is the largest post office, the largest convention center, the world's leading commodity and produce markets.

With New York suffering industrial atrophy and decline, Chicago has become first in thirty-eight major industrial categories; mail order, appliance manufacture, commercial printing, metal manufacturing, office machines, cut stone products, canned and frozen foods—radio and TV production—steel—and scores more.

And it's happened so suddenly that most Chicagoans don't fully appreciate the fact that their city, in variety and excellence of architecture, exceeds any other in North America. Airliner crews approaching from over the lake never get over being spellbound by that skyline.

Chicago's four million population is a real potpourri. We have as many Italians as Rome, as many Poles as Warsaw, more Irish than Dublin—and even a substantial settlement of transplanted Arctic Eskimos.

For excellence and variety of food, no place compares: Greek, Spanish, Kosher, Scandinavian, Irish, Bohemian, Oriental.

And culture: Three of Chicago's 28 museums are incomparable.

Chicago's symphony is acknowledged number one in the nation, some say "in the world."

No city has more colleges.

I'm going to distract you if I suggest that most of this reflects Mayor Daley's stewardship.

This is not intended to recommend him for other office. His fierce dedication to being the greatest city's greatest mayor is the height of his own ambition.

Yesteryear's "second city," trying harder, has become "first!"

New Yorkers used to boast that they had Broadway; they still have—but now they're embarrassed by it.

Within 20 months, Michigan Avenue will eclipse Fifth Avenue as a marketplace for high fashion.

With every other city threatened with decay and bankruptcy—Chicago is more dynamic, more beautiful, more prosperous, "more everything" now.

THE "JAMES G. FULTON FLOOD PROTECTION PROJECT"

THE SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HEINZ) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HEINZ. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I was pleased to cosponsor H.R. 13765, offered by the entire Pennsylvania delegation. This legislation would appropriately name the Chartiers Creek Flood Protection Project after the late Congressman James G. Fulton.

This important project had the backing in Congress of Jim Fulton, and that is why I believe this project should be named after him. But I also believe that in proposing this memorial after Congressman Fulton, we are also recognizing the interest and foresight of local officials and private citizens who initiated the planning and development of this much needed flood control project. It was they who lived with the problems created by Chartiers Creek and it was they who worked closely with their Congressmen to get the Federal Government to develop a solution.

Jim Fulton's work with and in behalf of the people of the Chartiers Valley serves as an example of Jim Fulton's unremitting interest in and service to his district. He was a public servant in the best sense of the word. The feats he performed for the constituents of the 27th District of Pennsylvania and in fact for all of Allegheny County were legendary. Pittsburghers will always remember him on a personal and an individual basis as the man who went to bat for them in their problems with Government. He was aggressive and dashing in his approach, but his objective was always to help his constituents. They knew it, and they rewarded him and helped themselves by sending him back to Congress for 14 consecutive terms.

He is missed in Allegheny County today, and the naming of the James G. Fulton Flood Protection Project is a fitting tribute to a dedicated man.

The bill follows:

H.R. 13765

A bill to designate the portion of the project for flood control protection on Chartiers Creek that is within Allegheny County, Pennsylvania, as the "James G. Fulton Flood Protection Project"

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the portion of the project for flood protection on Chartiers Creek that is within Allegheny County, Pennsylvania, authorized by section 204 of the Flood Control Act of 1965 (P.L. 89-298), shall be designated as the "James G. Fulton Flood Protection Project". Any reference to such project in any law, regulation, map, document, record, or other paper of the United States shall be held to be a reference to the "James G. Fulton Flood Protection Project".

Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill to name the Carnegie-Bridgeville reach of the Chartiers Creek Local Flood Protection Project in Pennsylvania in honor of our late and beloved colleague, James G. Fulton.

This project, designed specifically to serve his congressional district, would become the James G. Fulton Local Flood Protection Project, Chartiers Creek, Allegheny County, Pa.

The Members of the House are well aware of our late colleague's devotion to his responsibilities as a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and of the Committee on Science and Astronautics. This bill would memorialize his devotion to his responsibilities as a representative of the 27th District of Pennsylvania.

Chartiers Creek is located in Allegheny and Washington Counties, southwestern Pennsylvania. In many parts of our country, the creek would be called a river. The stream in its natural state is 52 miles long from its source about 6 miles south of Washington, Pa., to its mouth on the Ohio River at McKees Rocks, 2.6 miles below Pittsburgh, Pa. The Chartiers Creek Basin is roughly rectangular in shape with a length of about 24 miles and an average width of about 12 miles. The drainage area above the mouth is 277 square miles.

There are a number of tributaries. The steep profiles of the tributaries lend themselves to rapid runoff from the sometimes severe local storms typical of the region. Frequent flooding of the valley flow resulted.

The communities of the Chartiers Creek basin that were affected by floods are old, established and well-developed. The valley is primarily industrial, but there are also large commercial and residential zones in the areas subject to flooding. Annual flooding was accepted as a matter of course, with severe flooding occurring on an average of every 5 or 6 years.

The flood that brought official Federal recognition occurred in connection with Hurricane Hazel in October 1954. Congressman Fulton and other local representatives pressed for emergency action and on the 26th of October the President declared the flooded localities in and around Allegheny County, including the Chartiers Creek valley, a disaster area.

In the following June, Mr. Fulton introduced a resolution to the House Committee on Public Works, requesting a survey of Chartiers Creek for flood control, the beginning of a long struggle for authorization and appropriation. In the meantime, the flood of August 1956 occurred, the most severe of recent record, causing damages amounting to over \$5,000,000—April 1962 values—in the Allegheny County part of Chartiers Creek Valley alone. Once again Mr. Fulton called on Federal, State, and local offices and agencies for assistance, and once again the valley was officially included in a disaster area.

Efforts to obtain congressional approval and funds were finally successful, and the survey started in November 1957. Each succeeding year, 1958, 1959, 1960, and 1961, our colleague sought for and obtained budget funds to continue the survey, which was completed in February 1963. The recommendations were for improvement of about 11 miles of creek channel from about 3½ miles above the mouth to the southern limits of the borough of Bridgeville in Allegheny County, and improvement of about 5 miles of creek channel through the adjoining boroughs of Canonsburg and Houston in Washington County.

I will not burden you with the details of getting the Allegheny County project underway. This job required much more than successful competition for Federal funds with other worthwhile projects. The city of Pittsburgh, six boroughs and five townships, all affected by valley flooding, had to be persuaded to agree to local cooperation. A large trunk sewer had been constructed in the channel bed for most of the creek within the project limits. Relocation of this sewer was a must, but payment for the relocation as part of the local cost participation was beyond the capabilities of the smaller municipal partners in the enterprise. Finally, after much effort, Federal, State, and county funds were pledged in their proper proportions.

On the 27th of June 1968, a contract was awarded to the Irvin T. Miller Construction Co. of Burgettstown, Pa. for construction of unit 1. On the 26th of July 1968, Congressman James G. Fulton launched the groundbreaking ceremony attended by dignitaries from the several levels of Government concerned with the project. Typical of the man, an important commitment to a congressional task took him away before completion of the ceremony.

Jim Fulton lived to see the business area of old Carnegie Borough revitalized. He lived to see a potential flood carried safely through the improved channel in May 1971. He lived to note that on the 5th of October 1971 the President signed the appropriations bill carrying fiscal year 1972 funds for Chartiers Creek. And on the 6th of October, Jim Fulton died.

In the orderly progress of construction, the job will probably take another 4 years to finish. At this mid-point, it is altogether fitting that we memorialize the man who was so instrumental in its inception.

DNC CHAIRMAN O'BRIEN TALKS ABOUT TAX REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. REUSS) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, Lawrence O'Brien, chairman of the Democratic National Committee, had some noteworthy things to say about tax reform last week.

In a speech to the Yale Political Union on March 7, Chairman O'Brien emphasized that:

Tax reform is an issue whose time is a lot closer to coming than many professional politicians admit, or even recognize.

If Mr. O'Brien is right, and I am convinced he is, President Nixon may find himself in an uncomfortable position. So far, the Nixon policy on taxes has been, as Mr. O'Brien describes it, to:

Initiate only those tax proposals that favor corporations and the wealthy, diminishing even further the revenue-producing capacity of the federal tax system. Then unveil the proposal for a value-added tax would make more regressive a tax structure that already discriminates heavily against the lower to upper-middle income taxpayer.

Chairman WILBUR MILLS of the House Ways and Means Committee has given President Nixon the opportunity to make a new start on tax reform, urging the President to submit tax reform proposals to Congress by March 15. With that deadline 1 day away, the President has still not responded to Chairman MILLS' February 7 letter.

This failure of leadership on the President's part is discouraging. As Mr. O'Brien notes:

My years on Capitol Hill have taught me that strong presidential leadership is the essential ingredient in any serious tax reform effort. The President must define the battle ground, marshal the troops, organize public opinion and personally commit his prestige to passage of legislation in the House and Senate.

The full text of Chairman O'Brien's speech follows:

REMARKS BY DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL CHAIRMAN LAWRENCE F. O'BRIEN TO YALE POLITICAL UNION, ART GALLERY, YALE UNIVERSITY, NEW HAVEN, CONN., TUESDAY, MARCH 7, 1972

It is a pleasure for me to be with you this evening, members and guests of the Yale Political Union.

My message this evening is, in part, a report on our considerable efforts to modernize and rebuild the oldest political union in the western world—the Democratic Party. This effort is by no means completed and we cannot assume that success is certain. But this much we already know: for the past three years the Democratic Party nationally and in the states has totally changed its way of doing business.

We have moved away from traditions and practices that kept many people on the sidelines, effectively blocked from participating in critical decisions of the party such as presidential nominations and writing of the platform. We have moved toward an open party, one where any interested and motivated person has a chance to make a difference in the decisions that are reached. By comparison, the Republican Party has turned its back on meaningful reform, relying instead on grandly worded manifestoes

totally lacking the enforcement machinery required to get the job done.

In the wake of the 1968 Democratic National Convention, the two Democratic Party reform commissions—one chaired by Senator George McGovern of South Dakota, the other by Representative James O'Hara of Michigan—began the extraordinary assignment of analyzing and recommending changes in the entire process of selecting delegates for the national convention and in the procedures of the national convention itself. This kind of comprehensive study had never been attempted before by either the Democratic or Republican parties.

In these early days, the cynics—and there were many of them—assumed that some lofty language, coupled with the reformers' traditional problem of maintaining their early momentum, would limit the scope and impact of the reforms. In due time the zealots would grow tired of the enterprise and all could get back to normal.

I can report that the cynics were mistaken. Fifty states established their own reform commissions. The Democratic National Committee unanimously adopted the recommendations of both the McGovern and the O'Hara Commissions. State after state—even those that had originally rejected the reforms out of hand—changed their rules and procedures to comply with the 18 guidelines governing delegate selection.

We even remain hopeful that Connecticut—one of our last problem states—will resolve the current dispute in time to assure its delegation being seated in Miami Beach without challenge.

You may find some of these statistics interesting:

In 1972, 99 per cent of the delegates to the Democratic National Convention will be elected in open competition; 1 per cent will be selected by state committees. In 1968, 15 per cent were chosen by state committees.

In Arizona, six party officials chose all the delegates for the 1968 convention. Last month in Arizona, 36,000 Democrats participated in legislative district meetings to elect the delegation. Forty per cent of the delegates will be 30 years of age or younger. In 1968, no delegate was under 30.

In West Virginia, 268 people have filed for the 38 delegate positions to be elected in the May 9 primary. In Georgia, where the entire '68 delegation was hand-picked by the governor, 350 persons have already filed their names to compete for the 53 delegate slots.

In 1968, 20 state Democratic Parties had no written rules, making it literally impossible for some persons to discover how they could take part in the delegate-selection process. By July 1972, every state party will have written rules that are readily available to all interested persons.

In Iowa, 45,000 Democrats turned out in a raging snow storm to participate in the precinct caucuses. Even greater numbers turned up at the Minnesota precinct meetings.

In these states a new generation of Democrats participated as equals with the older members of the party . . . winning some, losing some, but discovering that the doors were open wide at each stage in the nominating process.

This new generation of Democrats is by no means limited to first-time voters. It includes millions of women—the most neglected majority in the nation—as well as blacks, Spanish-speaking Americans, Indians and other minorities. Precinct caucuses have disclosed record numbers of suburban housewives, trade union members, and professional men and women. In the midwest, farmers and rural residents have been visible and active.

Today brings the nation's first presidential primary in New Hampshire, with 23 more to

go before the National Convention convenes July 10. This new generation of Democrats unquestionably will have a major voice in determining the outcome of the primaries.

If these initial trends continue, we will arrive in Miami Beach with what, in essence, is a new Democratic Party, capping one of the most unique political reform efforts in American history.

The ramifications of these changes will be profound. We hear much about the need to reform Congress and state legislatures. I submit that the necessary first step in any such broader reform process must be straightening out the political parties themselves. Moreover, when faced with the challenge of reform, established political institutions have usually chosen to ignore the challenge and consequently die. The Democratic Party has elected to live.

When I returned in March 1970 as national Democratic chairman, I said that no concern had higher priority on my personal agenda than full implementation of the reform objectives. I stressed this point for one reason: the challenge to the American political system that we have been witnessing demanded this kind of affirmation action. Having only limited influence in Republican circles, I concentrated my efforts on the Democrats.

But it will take more than the internal recasting of our political parties to surmount the continuing crisis of confidence that erodes some of our most basic political institutions. In the past decade there has taken place a frightening decline in the peoples' faith that representative government—local, state and national—was acting in their best interests, or even that it was under their ultimate control.

Can anyone today seriously doubt what would result from another decade of a comparable loss of popular faith in the actions of government? Were this to happen, we would find ourselves in a period of extreme danger, circumstances where the entire democratic enterprise could easily flounder and collapse.

While I consider our reforms within the Democratic Party as an important step in restoring popular faith in our two-party system, I know also that the political parties—as well as the men and women who run for office—must be far more responsive in those areas of public policy that directly affect peoples' lives. There must be irrefutable evidence that the governmental system is more than an exclusive arrangement designed to protect those already in the club. Only this kind of demonstration—repeated again and again—will begin the extremely difficult job of rebuilding popular confidence in our democratic system.

In my view, the issue of tax reform offers this opportunity in 1972. It is a bit unusual—indeed, some persons would say distinctly out of place—for a national party chairman to speak this directly about a public issue that has always been highly controversial, particularly on the floor of the House and Senate.

For eight years I served two Presidents as the principal White House liaison with Congress. On the basis of this experience, I know the extreme difficulties that inevitably are encountered in attempting to legislate meaningful tax reform. Nonetheless, I repeat: *tax reform is an issue whose time is a lot closer to coming than many professional politicians admit, or even recognize.*

This is true for one basic reason: the average citizen is awakening to the fact that our existing tax structure is highly regressive, that low, middle and even some upper-income people pay as high a percentage in total taxes as the very wealthy. In some instances, the less affluent pay a considerably higher percentage of their income in taxes than the more affluent. As this popular

awakening goes forward, a growing number of citizens are demanding that steps be taken to remedy the situation.

Consider these facts:

Families with annual incomes between \$6000 and \$25,000 pay almost the same share in taxes, approximately 30 per cent.

21,317 persons with more than \$20,000 annual income paid no federal income taxes in 1969.

301 individuals with more than \$200,000 annual income paid no federal income taxes in 1969. Two years later, after the tax reform act of 1969 supposedly established a minimum tax for everyone, 112 persons with incomes over \$200,000 still paid no federal income taxes.

Persons with annual incomes under \$3,000 paid 14.1 per cent of their income in total taxes.

The 19 largest oil companies with net income of \$8.85 billion paid an average corporate income tax of 8.7 per cent.

The elimination of the principal tax loopholes and special tax advantages would increase federal tax revenues annually by an estimated \$77 billion without changing the 1972 tax rates or personal exemptions and including a flat \$1300 standard deduction.

These same loopholes require the great majority of American taxpayers to pay an additional \$300 to \$385 a year in federal taxes.

Or, to look at the problem from another perspective, the elimination of these special tax advantages would permit a straight 43 percent across-the-board cut in all tax rates without incurring any loss in government revenue.

It is not my role this evening to define precisely the ingredients of a politically achievable tax reform package. There are myriad combinations and mixtures that would represent a considerable improvement over our present circumstances. But I am here to say categorically that the *status quo* is grossly unfair to an overwhelming majority of Americans—especially those in the middle and lower end of the income scale. As these Americans discover the fiscal facts of life, a surprising number of public officials may conclude that meaningful tax reform is preferable to involuntary retirement.

There is another and equally important dimension to the problem. Through an incredible series of economic blunders, President Nixon has managed to accumulate the highest three-year federal budget deficit in American peace time history. As a result, the federal government finds itself strapped financially, unable to meet a host of vital domestic needs.

Moreover, under Mr. Nixon's leadership, the federal tax structure has grown steadily more regressive, with corporations now benefiting from a package of tax breaks costing the federal treasury billions of dollars annually. Now, all at once, Mr. Nixon has launched a full throttle effort to locate new sources of federal revenue.

No politician in his right mind is about to talk openly of increasing individual income tax rates this year. So Mr. Nixon apparently has decided to sneak in the back door with a national sales tax, otherwise known as the value-added tax. Nobody has suggested that this is a good tax, or a fair tax, or even a desirable tax. The best argument anyone has come up with so far is that you might get away with it. The tax is so complicated and so well disguised in the manufacturing process that people supposedly won't even know it exists. But I have more respect than the Nixon administration for the intelligence of the American people.

To make it more attractive, Mr. Nixon has talked of using the value-added tax to replace a portion of local property taxes that support public education. But even this car-

rot cannot hide the fatal flaw in the value-added tax: it remains a highly regressive tax that will further distort our already distorted tax structure. And its adoption would almost surely doom any serious effort to achieve real tax reform, at least for the foreseeable future.

But in tax reform, as in many other areas, Mr. Nixon would like to stake out a position on both sides of the issue. In addition to the trial balloons promoting the value-added tax, Mr. Nixon has promised to send a tax reform package to the Congress.

Responding to this expression of presidential interest in tax reform, Chairman Wilbur Mills of the House Committee on Ways and Means has written to Mr. Nixon urging that tax reform proposals be forwarded to Capitol Hill without delay. More to the point, Mr. Mills has suggested that any such proposals should be received by March 15 in order to be considered this year. March 15 is one week away and, to the best of my knowledge, Mr. Nixon has not replied to Chairman Mills' letter.

My years on Capitol Hill have taught me that strong presidential leadership is the essential ingredient in any serious tax reform effort. The President must define the battle ground, marshal the troops, organize public opinion and personally commit his prestige to passage of the legislation in the House and Senate. Mr. Nixon's failure even to respond to Chairman Mills' invitation means only one thing: *the President and the Republican Party want no part of tax reform in 1972, if ever.* I believe this is an issue the Democratic Party should take to the people in our platform and in the presidential election.

In the tax area, the Nixon-Republican track record is clear: initiate only those tax proposals that favor corporations and the wealthy, diminishing even further the revenue-producing capacity of the federal tax system. Then unveil the proposal for a value-added tax that would make more regressive a tax structure that already discriminates heavily against the lower to upper-middle income taxpayer. So I repeat: the Democrats should take this issue to the people in 1972.

If one has any lingering doubts about Mr. Nixon's motive in all of this, recall his violent opposition to the Democratic proposal for public financing of the presidential election through a dollar check-off on individual federal income tax returns. This proposal—first initiated by the Democrats in 1965—would have made possible a presidential campaign financed by voluntary one dollar contributions from millions of taxpayers. Persons would simply designate that one dollar of their federal taxes be placed in a special presidential campaign fund maintained by the U.S. Treasury. Under this system, private campaign contributions would then be forbidden.

This would have ended all contributions from special interests, the prime source of funds in any presidential campaign. It would have achieved—in one stroke—a revolutionary breakthrough in campaign financing, making it possible—for the first time—for presidential candidates to avoid the dangerous and degrading practice of relying on special interests for the millions of dollars that are now required to run a national campaign.

The dollar check-off proposal passed the Senate on a party-line vote, but was dropped for 1972 by the House-Senate conference on the emergency tax reduction legislation. It was abandoned simply because Mr. Nixon promised to veto the entire tax reduction bill if House-Senate conference accepted the dollar check-off provision. Given the miserable shape of our economy, this was not a risk the conference committee was willing to run.

Mr. Nixon's adamant opposition to public financing of presidential campaigns arose from precisely the same motives that today keep him from proposing meaningful tax reform: the Nixon administration's commitment to serving a variety of special interests rather than championing the interests of the general public. In my view, the American people can forget about reform of campaign financing, just as they can forget about tax reform, as long as Mr. Nixon serves as President of the United States.

These are the differences around which presidential campaigns should be waged, differences that are distinct, understandable, and decisive to the course of public policy. Given the stakes in 1972, not only for the Democratic Party but, more significantly, for the revitalization of the entire political process, I intend to do everything in my power to make this a principal Democratic issue in the months ahead.

In my judgment, if the Democratic Party elects to follow this course of action—if we take directly to the people the issue of vested interests versus the general good as epitomized in the differences between Democrats and Republicans in the reform of party rules, campaign financing and taxes—we will have an excellent chance of making Richard Nixon the first President since Herbert Hoover to seek re-election and fall.

And that, to my way of thinking, is a goal worth pursuing.

THE FAA DICTATES—PART V

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KARTH) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, in my last report on the high-handed methods used by the FAA's Administrator, John H. Shaffer, to pressure local officials, I discussed the first part of a letter he wrote in reply to a request for clarification of his position. As I reported, Mr. Shaffer had assured me verbally and in a letter that he would remain neutral in the local discussion over the siting of a second airport in the Twin Cities.

When the Administrator publicly broke his word of neutrality, I wrote him to remind him of his earlier pledge and requested from him a clarification of his position. In addition, I forwarded to the Administrator a copy of a letter I had received from a Northwest Airlines executive which raised some very serious questions over the second airport site that the Administrator favored and also questioned the need to build a second major airport in the Minneapolis-St. Paul area.

I sent this letter to Mr. Shaffer without comment to give him the benefit of an airline executive's views on this complex subject as well as a courtesy to a constituent.

As my last report showed, Mr. Shaffer replied in an intemperate manner over the environmental questions that had been raised over the airport site he favored. He also displayed an inability to comprehend views and studies that differed from his own bias.

The second half of that letter under discussion today not only continued in much the same manner, but suggested that forwarding a constituent's views to the proper Federal officials is an endorsement of those views.

After blasting local officials over their concern for the environment, Mr. Shaffer

proceeded to discuss the Northwest Airline's letter:

I am not so charitable in my reactions to the assertions contained in the Ben Griggs letter accompanying yours. You might remind Mr. Griggs that the public is part owner of Wold-Chamberlain—to the tune of \$13,063,753 in the form of past Federal financial assistance in its development. As the Administrator of that public trust, I am involved from the time of first public utterance of any intent to abandon that public investment. Stated differently, this isn't likely to be a Nyrop-Griggs decision.

Mr. Speaker, I might point out that neither I nor the president of Northwest Airlines, Mr. Donald Nyrop, or Ben Griggs—who wrote the letter—had ever suggested that the final decision was going to be dictated by Northwest Airlines. However, as a major airline based in the Twin Cities I think a fair minded person would want to take their views into consideration when planning a major change in the airport facilities in that company's area.

Mr. Shaffer's letter continued:

I agree with Mr. Griggs that under certain circumstances a "replacement" airport is the proper course to be pursued in contrast to development of a "second airport." However, it is not the proper course to be applied wholesale throughout the Nation if the public's \$2 billion investment in existing airports is to pay out. Wold-Chamberlain may or may not deserve replacement; I do not presently know nor does either Griggs or Nyrop. I am aware of its critical noise situation. I also remind us both that the problem exists because appropriate local actions were not taken to properly zone and protect its surrounding areas. I am reluctant to conclude that the public at large should bear the cross resulting from past actions or rather inactions on the part of a few.

Unless local government is prepared to reimburse the Federal Government in the amount of its past public investment, any action to abandon or materially alter the character of Wold-Chamberlain requires Federal agreement. If the evidence clearly substantiates this as a necessary public action, that agreement will be readily given. Quite obviously, however, that evidence must be far more extensive than a showing that an operating benefit to Northwest Airlines will be the principal gain. (Emphasis by Mr. Shaffer.)

I regret not having been able to respond in a more tacit fashion. I personally feel, however, that the depth and complexity of the issues involved cannot and should not be confined to the viewpoints which flow solely from parochial state and local interests.

Mr. Speaker, one thing that strikes me about this letter is that outside of a comment that the Metro council's decision to veto the Ham Lake site for a second time "was the straw which burst the dam," Mr. Shaffer never explains the central question I was asking—to wit, Why did he break his pledge of neutrality?

Rather than go over Mr. Shaffer's unusual letter point by point, I believe the letter I wrote to him in reply well sums the situation as I viewed it. That letter began:

While respecting your right to hold an opinion concerning the decisions I make as a Congressman, I must emphatically disagree with some of the gross distortions and insinuations made in your letter of January 14, 1971.

Your accusation that I have involved myself in the Ham Lake site controversy primarily, if not solely, because of Mr. Nyrop's interest (President, Northwest Orient Airlines) is frankly, preposterous, and indicates your complete ignorance of the real issues involved.

The Minnesota State Department of Conservation, too, is opposed to the Ham Lake site. I trust you are not accusing that distinguished group of professionals similarly.

More than three thousand (3,000+) resident constituents have written to me opposing the Ham Lake site for the same reasons I oppose it. You wouldn't suggest that they, too, are in league with Mr. Nyrop?

Dr. Leslie Glasgow, former Assistant Secretary of the U.S. Department of the Interior, also vigorously opposed the Ham Lake site, and I attach a copy of his letter dated October 8, 1970 to recall to you his unequivocal stand.

Mr. Fred J. Russell, Under Secretary of the U.S. Department of the Interior, voiced extreme caution (if not opposition) and concern in a letter to Congressman Dingell, dated January 4, 1971, a copy of which is also being made available to you.

On January 15, 1971, in response to an inquiry made by Congressman Dingell, Secretary of Transportation John Volpe committed himself to complying with existing Federal laws and unlike you, avoided voicing a parochial, personal or bureaucratic bias.

Your incredible accusation that the Metropolitan Council's decision to veto the Ham Lake site (for a second time) by a vote of 9-5 was not calm and systematic, contradicts every report of that meeting that has reached my office.

In addition, your uncalled-for insinuations of giving me the "benefit of the doubt" that I am looking out "for your constituency's best interests," is surely unworthy of anyone who holds a responsible Federal office such as yours.

In addition, you have apparently failed to read or comprehend the total environmental report and properly assess the ensuing cost to make Ham Lake environmentally and ecologically sound (if at all). This betrays a visceral rather than a rational reaction.

Aside from the serious nature of the foregoing which I intend to pursue, I inquire as to the reasons why you violated your written commitment to me on October 29, 1970 in which you stated, "I intend to remain aloof from all pressures to become personally involved in an essentially state and local matter."

Apparently, you need to be reminded that as a Congressman I am often called upon by constituents to forward letters to Federal officials with a request for a reply. You seem to be of the mistaken opinion that forwarding a letter such as that by Mr. Griggs, indicates a blanket endorsement of its contents. While I perhaps do have areas of agreement with the position stated by Mr. Griggs, I was forwarding his letter for an answer and asking for a clarification of your public position on Ham Lake because you have not been unequivocal.

Finally, I never have asked a Federal official to "knuckle under" to my wishes or position, nor would I want a responsible official to do likewise to any other Congressman. While I am not seeking special respect for myself personally, I do believe the office I hold deserves at least a modicum of common courtesy.

Frankly, in my 12 years as a Congressman, I have never previously had my motives questioned nor my legitimate concern for my district disparaged.

With all due respect to your right to hold an opinion at variance from mine, I find that you have impugned the reasons for my interest and, therefore my integrity.

Mr. Speaker, after this exchange of correspondence, Mr. Shaffer came to my office for a conference. At that meeting the Administrator and I had a frank exchange of views. Of primary importance to me, though, was the assurance from Mr. Shaffer that he would allow the duly authorized local officials to make their decision without further badgering from him.

And then, Mr. Speaker, nearly 1 year to the day I was rather surprised—although I suppose considering Mr. Shaffer's past track record on his pledges I should not have been—to see the FAA's Administrator once again make news in the Twin Cities. This time he not only responded to inquiries from the press with disdainful remarks for those who do not share his views, but initiated a new "front" through a letter to the chairman of the Metropolitan Airports Commission. The Administrator was cute this time. He did not come right out and say the second airport must be placed at the environmentally unsound site at Ham Lake. Rather he dismissed the other proposed site for airspace reasons—by the process of elimination he once again was promoting the twice-rejected Ham Lake site.

In my next report I will discuss Mr. Shaffer's latest attempt to steamroll local officials.

BILL TO CORRECT INEQUITY IN MILITARY HOUSING

(Mr. SIKES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill to help correct an inequity which exists because of the poor quality of certain on-base housing units to which military families are assigned. The fact that this inequality creates a moral problem repeatedly has been brought to my attention and to the attention of my colleagues on the Appropriations Subcommittee on Military Construction who are cosponsoring this bill. Cosponsors of the bill are Mr. CEDERBERG, Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, Mr. LONG of Maryland, Mr. MCKAY, Mr. PATTEN, and Mr. TALCOTT.

Our bill would give the Secretaries of the military services the power to determine which on-base housing units are, in fact, inadequate. Under present law, acquired Wherry units and housing with mortgages insured under section 207 of the National Housing Act cannot be so designated. Many of these units are pitifully substandard, and yet military families assigned to them are required to pay the same rent—forfeiture of their full quarters allowance—as are other personnel who occupy fully adequate housing. This bill would allow them to pay the fair market rental for such housing, up to 75 percent of their basic allowance for quarters. However, in order to avoid an economic loss on the operation of such housing, the deduction from quarters allowance could not be less than the cost of operating and maintaining these units.

It is the intent of this legislation both to correct the inequity to personnel eligible for quarters who occupy substandard quarters and to make additional substandard quarters available to personnel who are not currently eligible for on-base quarters. I am reliably informed that this legislation could be administered to achieve both of these objectives, and I expect that it will be.

I include a more technical explanation of the bill at this point in the RECORD:

The inadequate quarters legislation of 42 U.S.C. 1594j has proved insufficient to afford equitable relief to military personnel assigned to quarters which fail to meet current DOD standards of adequacy. Subsections (e) and (g) of the law, requiring all houses determined inadequate pursuant to subsection (c) to be either improved, demolished, or otherwise disposed of not later than 30 June 1962 and 1 July 1965, respectively, operate to terminate the apparently continuing authority under subsection (c) of the several Secretaries named therein to determine housing inadequate as public quarters, so as to permit its occupancy without full forfeiture of BAQ under subsection (a) of the law. In addition, subsection (f) of the law specifically precluded designation of acquired Wherry housing and housing with mortgages insured under section 207 of the National Housing Act, regardless of their factual adequacy.

Until they can either be replaced or improved to meet DOD minimum standards of adequacy, the Services must continue to use numerous public quarters to satisfy their existing housing requirements which, although they cannot under 42 U.S.C. 1594j be determined inadequate, fail to meet DOD minimum adequacy standards. The Services are concerned over the inequity resulting from the fact that their personnel assigned to these quarters must forfeit full BAQ therefor, notwithstanding their factual inadequacy. To eliminate such inequity, continuing authority should be granted to permit the military secretaries to designate as inadequate any quarters which do not satisfy adequacy standards, free from the limitations of subsections (e), (f), and (g) of 42 U.S.C. 1594j. The Secretary of Transportation was granted such authority relative to Coast Guard Housing, to expire on June 30, 1972, by Section 11 of P.L. 91-278 approved June 12, 1970.

The substantial increase in BAQ levels render it imperative that authorization be obtained for new and continuing designation of inadequate family housing and for occupancy thereof at a charge less than the full amount of the occupant's BAQ. Such increase will substantially aggravate the inequities presently existing from the use of such facilities as public quarters and can be expected to give rise to even more acute morale problems in the near future.

The need for legislation to permit adjusted BAQ forfeitures consistent with the real worth of the housing units was specifically discussed during Secretary Chafee's testimony before the Subcommittee on Military Construction of the House Appropriations Committee on 22 June 1971.

RECOMMENDATION

New legislation be obtained to authorize the military secretaries to designate as inadequate family housing facilities which fail to meet standards of adequacy established by the Secretary of Defense, and to permit their voluntary occupancy by military personnel with dependents, charging the fair rental value thereof, but not to exceed 75% of the occupant's BAQ, against the occupant's BAQ, and payment to the occupant of the difference as an adjusted BAQ. (For purposes of simplification of administration, housing facilities previously designated in-

adequate under 42 U.S.C. 1594j could be redetermined to be inadequate under the new law.)

THE CURRY'S—ONE OF WEST FLORIDA'S LEADING EARLY FAMILIES

(Mr. SIKES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, western Florida during the 19th century was settled largely by families migrating from the Carolinas and Georgia in search of new lands and broader opportunities. Some of them stopped for a while, maybe even for a decade or two, in Alabama before moving on into west Florida.

The head of one such family was Whitmill Curry, whose descendants have been numerous and active in the development of their communities for more than 100 years. In providing leadership, they have followed the example of their illustrious progenitor and his good wife, Martha Goodman Lassiter Curry. She and Whitmill Curry were married in Georgia in 1847 and soon moved to Alabama.

The family remained in Henry County, Ala., through the War Between the States, in which Whitmill Curry served as a lieutenant in Company F, 11th Florida Infantry. Upon returning home at the end of that tragic struggle, he moved his family to west Florida to try to start a new life in an area which was largely undeveloped but full of opportunity.

Born to Whitmill and Martha Curry between 1848 and 1869 were 12 children, George Thomas, Nancy Elizabeth, Missouri, Marcus Lafayette, Titus Darius, Virginia, Shumuel Seaton, Martha Amanda, James Whitmill, Mary, Jeremiah Fletcher, and Isagora May. In time each established families of his own in the west Florida area their parents had chosen as home. They and their descendants have played prominent roles in the business and professional life of their respective communities, with a special affinity for education and the ministry.

In that, too, they followed the example of their progenitor, Whitmill Curry, who was a minister and a frontier educator. He was instrumental in establishing at least three Holmes County churches, and he was the country's first superintendent of schools. He was also the principal founder and first postmaster of Isagora, a Holmes County community near the Choctawhatchee River. He named the community for his infant daughter, Isagora May. A nearby river steamboat landing bears the Curry name, although the last steamboat docked there 40 years ago.

An estimated 2,500 descendants of Whitmill and Martha Curry are estimated to be living today, most of them in western Florida.

Forebears of the Curry family migrated to this continent from the British Isles well before 1750, settling along the Atlantic Seaboard. The family was well represented in the Carolinas, where several Currys served in the Continental

Army—and where legend says a few remained loyal to King George.

One of the early Currys of South Carolina was Col. Joseph Curry, a land surveyor and colonial official. He was doing his surveying in South Carolina at about the time George Washington was engaged in the same activity to the north in Virginia.

From the Atlantic seaboard, descendants of the early Currys carried the name across the Nation. Place names now bearing that distinguished name include Curryville, Ga.; Curryville, Mo.; Curry, N. Mex.; Curry, Oreg., and Curry County, Oreg. One of the most notable members of the family in the South was Jabez Lamar Monroe Curry, a native of Lincoln County, Ga., who understandably was known by his initials J. L. M. A statesman and educator, he lived from 1825 to 1903, and worked for 60 years to make education possible for all Negro and white children in the South. He administered the George Peabody Fund for public education in the South after 1888, and served as agent of the Slater Fund for Negro Schools after 1890. In 1899, he became president of the Southern Educational Board.

J. L. M. Curry served in the U.S. House of Representatives from 1857 to 1861, in the Confederate Congress from 1861 to 1864, and in the Confederate Army during the latter part of 1864 and early 1865. He was president of Howard College from 1865 to 1868, and U.S. Minister to Spain from 1885 to 1888 and again in 1902. Alabama placed his statue in the Statuary Hall collection in the Capitol. His distinguished service to the United States and to the Confederate States of America, both before and after their historic bloody disagreement—and to the cause of mankind through education—has been an inspiration to other bearers of the Curry name, including those who planted that name firmly and indelibly in western Florida more than a century ago.

This information on the Curry family was researched and assembled by the Honorable E. W. Carswell, a well known historian and writer of Chipley, Fla. I am greatly indebted to him for his cooperation and assistance.

THE 1972 HIGHWAY NEEDS REPORT

(Mr. KOCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of Transportation, John A. Volpe, sent to Congress the 1972 Highway Needs Report today. The significance of the report is its recommendation that authorization be given for the use of highway trust fund revenues to finance urban mass transit projects where appropriate. The report proposes "a series of fundamental changes in the Federal programs of funding highway construction and urban mass transportation facilities and equipment."

The Secretary's recommendation for establishment of a single urban fund to finance urban highway and mass transit

projects is an important breakthrough in the Government's transportation policy. It is a recognition that there are critical transportation problems in our urban areas that can only be met if States and localities are given flexibility to direct our transportation resources into those facilities that can provide the fastest and most convenient means of transportation possible.

Secretary John A. Volpe, stating that the Interstate System cannot be completed until 1980 because of unavoidable delays, has recommended that its funding be scaled down from \$4 billion annually to \$3.25 billion in fiscal year 1974 and 1975 and to \$3 billion for fiscal years 1976 through 1979. The money freed from this program would be available to meet some of the pressing urban transportation problems now in need of attention.

The report also acknowledges a need in some areas to reevaluate some controversial segments of the Interstate System yet to be built with consideration being given to alternative facilities.

Mr. Speaker, I would hope that the Congress will increase the share allocated to the single urban fund for the report's recommended highway share still outweighs the transit share. Surely our transit needs are of such magnitude at this time that they at least equal, and in my estimation more than equal, those of highways. But, this recommendation is not to diminish the support the Secretary deserves for his far sighted and responsible initiative in recommending some reallocations in our transportation program and flexibility for its administration by State and local officials.

For the interest of our colleagues, I am submitting for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement issued by the Department of Transportation summarizing the recommendations of the 1972 Highway Needs Report:

Secretary of Transportation John A. Volpe today recommended a program under which money from the Highway Trust Fund could be used for urban public transportation or highways, at the option of State or local authorities, beginning with \$1.0 billion in fiscal year 1974.

The recommendation was contained in the Secretary's 1972 Highway Needs Report to Congress which also called for realignment of the Federal-Aid Highway System. He called for amendment of the Highway Revenue Act of 1956 to authorize for the first time the use of trust funds for other than highway-related projects, beginning July 1, 1973. Secretary Volpe said that specific legislation incorporating these and other proposals would be submitted to Congress shortly, together with a draft environmental impact statement as required by the National Environmental Policy Act.

Under the Secretary's proposal \$1.0 billion in trust funds would be authorized for capital investments on urban projects, including public transit, for the 1974 fiscal year. This fund, designated the Single Urban Fund (SUF), would be increased to \$1.850 billion for the 1975 fiscal year and to \$2.250 billion for the fiscal years 1976 through 1979.

Secretary Volpe said the change in the law is essential if the Transportation Department is to fulfill its mission to create a balanced transportation system and solve the problem of increasing urban congestion. "We must have the tools," he said, "if we are to

adequately serve the public, plan for the future and establish orderly and efficient movement of people and goods in our urban centers. The program is in complete conformance with President Nixon's program for meeting the transportation crisis which has built up over the years."

Under the proposal 40 percent of the Single Urban Fund would be distributed to the Nation's Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas (SMSA) according to their share of the total national SMSA population. Forty percent would be allocated to the States on the basis of their share of the national SMSA population and 20 percent would be reserved for discretionary use by the Secretary on urban transportation projects best suited to the needs of the cities. All these funds would be allocated on a 70-percent Federal and 30-percent State and local matching basis.

Secretary Volpe pointed out that, under his proposal, funds would be made available to the State and local governments for the planning and execution of projects best suited to meet their specific needs. He said it is not possible for the Federal Government in Washington to plan transportation programs to meet the needs of all areas.

It is proposed that each SMSA form a consortium of the local governments within its area to carry out the local urban transportation programs. It would be required that each consortium provide for representation by the highest elected official in each local government in the area; that it have a planning authority for all transportation modes and that no program could be initiated which was not in conformance with that planning; that it require proportional voting within the consortium, be authorized to prepare long-range planning and possess the authority to designate agencies to administer programs.

Also, the consortium would be required to submit in advance to the Governor of the State and to the Secretary of Transportation a multi-year comprehensive transportation plan for each program to be financed through the Single Urban Fund. All SUF programs would be subject to the same Federal review and approval procedures as those now in force for such projects.

In the event that an SMSA did not choose to form a consortium, the funds allotted to it would be retained for management by the State. Local officials within the area would then develop plans in cooperation with the State for programs to be financed through the Fund, subject to Federal approval.

In the proposed realignment of the Federal-aid highway program, present plans for completion of the Interstate System would not be disturbed except for the rate of funding and the completion date. The report noted that partly because of unavoidable delays in completion of segments of Interstate highways, it appears that the system cannot be completed until 1980. It recommended, therefore, the Interstate authorization be phased down from \$4.0 billion to \$3.250 billion annually for fiscal years 1974 and 1975 and to \$3.0 billion for fiscal years 1976 through 1979. The Interstate funds would continue to be allocated to the States on a 90/10 matching basis.

This proposed phase-down, said the Secretary's report, would make more money available for other programs and would permit an orderly completion of the Interstate System with a smooth transition into post-Interstate planning.

With respect to other Federal-aid systems, the report said some degree of obsolescence has crept into present alignments. Some of our present primary routes, it said, are on local roads and some of the secondary routes are on arterial highways. "It is evident," it added, "that some readjustment is in order if we wish to make the Federal-aid systems conform more closely to functional use."

To carry out this realignment it is proposed that all Federal-aid systems outside the Interstate System be readjusted as follows:

- "Select" Rural System.
- "Supplemental" Rural System.
- "Urban" System.

The Rural systems would be selected on the basis of their functional use. The "Select" Rural System would be designated by the State highway departments. The "Supplemental" Rural System would be selected by the State highway departments and the appropriate local officials. Together they would provide for the highway needs of the rural and small metropolitan areas of the country.

The "Urban" System would be selected through the urban transportation planning process and revised accordingly based on continuing land use and transportation planning. The selection would be subject to the approval of local elected officials.

The Secretary's report further proposes a Rural General Transportation Fund which also would be allocated to the States on a 70/30 matching basis for correction of such deficiencies on highways off the Federal-aid system or in modes other than highways.

The proposed authorization for Federal financing from the Highway Trust fund is as follows:

PROPOSED PROGRAM AUTHORIZATIONS

(In millions of dollars)

Highway trust fund	1974	1975	1976-79
Interstate.....	3,250	3,250	3,000
Single urban fund.....	1,000	1,850	2,250
Rural Federal-aid system.....	800	800	800
Rural general transportation fund.....	200	200	400
Safety and other programs.....	400	400	400
Total.....	5,650	6,500	6,850

¹ Additional urban mass transportation capital grants totaling \$850,000,000 would be funded in 1974 from the general fund of the Treasury; this would complete the \$3,100,000,000 contract authority provided by the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1970.

CAN THE ANTITRUST PROCESS BE TRUSTED?

(Mr. MIKVA asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, with every day that passes the ITT mess gets messier.

Grave questions have been presented, as the result of the continuing Senate hearings on the Kleindienst nomination, as to whether the antitrust policy of the United States is being carried out on the basis of the merits or of White House politics. Whether or not Mr. Kleindienst becomes Attorney General, we as a Congress must inquire as to the administration of the antitrust laws, the linchpin of our free enterprise system.

There has never been much question about the influence of vested economic interests over the policies and practices of our Government. But the recent revelations about the handling of the International Telephone & Telegraph merger have far broader implications for our system of government.

Who represented the public interest in the ITT merger settlement? It appears that the efforts of those in the Justice Department who are supposed to implement the antitrust policies legislated

by the people's elected representatives were arrogantly brushed aside by White House operatives who had more respect for the power of the private purse.

There was nothing particularly unusual about the ITT merger, except that for once the process of settling major antitrust cases has been fully exposed to public scrutiny. It is not a pretty sight. It casts a deep shadow of suspicion over the numerous conglomerate mergers approved by the Justice Department in recent years.

The impact of conglomerates on the economy of America can be gleaned from the study published last June by the House Judiciary Committee. The number of mergers has been increasing, and their impact on the public continues to broaden. It is therefore imperative that someone exercise the responsibility of seeing to it that more factors than wealth and influence go into the decision to approve mergers like International Telephone & Telegraph and Ling-Temco-Vought.

Mr. Speaker, it is imperative that the appropriate standing committees of the House and Senate take a long hard look at the process by which some of these mergers have been effected. We must restore some measure of integrity to the process, lest we forfeit whatever faith remains among the American people that the antitrust policy which is so crucial to their economic liberty is not up for auction to the highest bidder.

A SALUTE TO THE BLACK PRESS

(Mr. BUCHANAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, this week is National Black Press Week throughout the United States and it is, therefore, fitting that we recognize the important role that the black press is playing in our Nation today.

In the city of Birmingham, Ala., which it is my privilege to represent in the Congress, we have four outstanding black newspapers—the Birmingham Mirror, the Birmingham Times, the Birmingham World and the Baptist Leader.

Through reading these newspapers, I am often made aware of the opinions of many of my black constituents and of some of the additional problems which they face.

Although they are published only once a week, these papers provide important information to the black community which dailies and other weekly news media often miss.

They are important sources not only of information of interest to most in the black communities of our cities, but of commentary on actions by government, local, and national, which particularly affect blacks.

Owned and operated by blacks these papers throughout the Nation provide job opportunities and training for black journalists which is not always readily available in the largely white dominated press at large.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the members of the black press for the outstanding job they are doing not only in providing news and commentary for the black community but in bridging the gap of understanding between the races.

"TERM LIMITATION" SHOULD BE IMPOSED ON BOTH HOUSES OF THE CONGRESS, JUST AS WE HAVE ON THE EXECUTIVE

(Mr. HALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, this past week when I announced that I would not seek reelection to the House of Representatives, I said that I felt that the time had come to step aside and open the way for a new personality, with the youth, vigor, and enthusiasm that I think is an essential requirement for one who seeks to represent a constituency of some half million people. This reflects personal reassessment.

I further stated that I felt that a "term limitation" should be imposed on both Houses of the Congress, just as we have on the Executive, which would prevent election to office from becoming a way of life, and contribute significantly to the demise of the seniority system. I am morally certain we should also devise better ways of judicial appointments, plus tenure, and termination controls.

Toward that end, I am today offering legislation that proposes to amend the Constitution of the United States to limit the term of office of Representatives to six terms, and Members of the Senate to two. I do this with the knowledge that many of my friends and colleagues are already well past those limitations. However, I have developed the strong conviction that none of us here assembled are so wise, and indispensable, or so highly qualified that an unfillable void would be created if our longevity was curtailed. I have never held that repeated election to public office is qualification enough for committee chairmanship. On the contrary, it could very well serve as a reason for not providing an individual with the power that comes from ascendancy to the chair.

I have sat in these Chambers for 12 years—on many occasions listening to our younger Members orate at length about the evils of the seniority system. Now I am giving them an opportunity to help end it once and for all. I think we owe it to the representative system of government in a republic, and to the American people.

U.S. PRICE COMMISSION MUST CURB UTILITY RATE INCREASES

(Mr. MADDEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the Northern Indiana Public Service Co., during the last couple of months, has been striving to inflict upon their patrons a 16.5-percent electric rate increase. The

mayors and city councils of four north-west Indiana cities—Gary, Hammond, East Chicago, and Crown Point—have all passed resolutions opposing this unreasonable rate increase. The Northwest Indiana Council of Teachers, the Central Labor Union, the United Auto Workers, and many other organizations are fighting this increase in utility rates. Over 500 citizens of northwest Indiana went to Indianapolis, the State capital, to protest to the Indiana Public Service Commission over a month ago. Other representatives of the area are going to Washington to protest and testify before the Federal Price Commission against these raises.

For some reason or other the so-called phase II program of the administration is proving to be a gigantic hoax because the Federal Price Commission, whose duty it is to curb inflation, seems to be engaged in stalling and postponing its decision against these unreasonable increases. It appears that the Governor of Indiana and the Indiana Legislature were helpless when the notice of this fabulous raise in utility prices was announced by the Indiana Public Service Co. over a month ago.

I am proposing a resolution that the Congress investigate these seemingly uncontrolled price increases by our public utilities.

The Bell Telephone System in northwest Indiana was allowed a tremendous rate increase but a short time ago without any action from State or Federal authorities.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include with my remarks an article from the Gary, Ind., Post-Tribune pertaining to this complete defiance of the so-called anti-inflation price control activities of the Indiana Public Service Commission and the administration's Federal Price Commission.

The article follows:

LAKE UNITS TO PROTEST RATE HIKE

Four Lake County activist organizations today announced that up to 700 persons in 10 buses will demonstrate before the Indiana Public Service Commission (PSC) in Indianapolis Tuesday in opposition to a proposed electric rate increase for Northern Indiana.

Northern Indiana Public Service Co (NIPSCO) has proposed a 16.5 per cent rate increase and the PSC, which concluded hearings on the proposal last month, is expected to reach a decision later this month.

However, the U.S. Price Commission Thursday froze all utility rates until March 10 when it is scheduled to announce new guidelines. The four groups today announced they are appealing to the Price Commission to hold a hearing in Northwest Indiana.

The four are:

The Calumet Community Congress (CCC), represented at a press conference today by Martin Connelly, acting president, and Mike Barnes, executive director.

The Federation of Community Organizations (FCO), represented by Bill Daniels, president.

The Congress of Latin American Organizations, represented by John Gomez, president of the East Chicago Youth Advisory Board.

The Wishing Well, represented by Will Long, East Chicago.

CCC Acting President Connelly announced the "bus-cade" to Indianapolis during a press

conference at the Centennial Methodist Church, 8th and Rhode Island, and said, "The community has not been listened to; it has not been taken seriously" (by the PSC).

He said buses will leave from various points in Lake County—four from Gary—at 7:30 p.m. Tuesday. There will be a press conference at noon (11 a.m. Gary time) at the Presbyterian Metropolitan Center, 16th and Delaware in Indianapolis.

The session will be followed by a rally and the 700 demonstrators—or as many of them that will be admitted into the Statehouse—will meet with the members of the PSC.

Connelly said he already has made the appointments for 2 p.m. in Indianapolis (1 p.m. Gary time) with the three commissioners in Statehouse Room 901.

The groups will be expected back in Lake County at 4:30 p.m. (Gary time).

So far only one mayor, Robert Pastrick, of East Chicago, has promised to attend the demonstration. However, FCO President Daniels said he has been trying to reach Gary Mayor Richard G. Hatcher and Hammond Mayor Joe Klen.

Daniels said of Mayor Hatcher that "it seems he doesn't want to meet with the CCC."

Long, said Mayor Pastrick has agreed to donate two buses for the trip.

The cost of the trip will be borne by churches, unions and community groups in northern Lake County, according to Connelly.

Daniels asserted that "NIPSCO doesn't need an increase at this time." He noted that the utility is benefitting "from a lot of new businesses" in the last two years. He noted developments in Hammond and East Chicago.

Connelly said that NIPSCO, in 1970, earned a 16 per cent profit—"one of the highest of any utility in the country."

"The educational systems, the poor and the aged need money more than NIPSCO," said Connelly.

Gomez and Long stressed that the high level of unemployment and public assistance in the area should be considered in turning down NIPSCO's proposal.

"We expect the PSC members to act I might say 'negatively' since their track record shows they have done nothing in the public interest in the past," Connelly said.

The Price Commission's freeze on utility rates was announced in Washington Thursday. Connell, speaking for the four groups, said, they are happy the Price Commission acted.

But he said the "people" don't have much confidence in the commission.

"Since the Bell (Telephone) System was allowed a tremendous rate increase, we're not too sure this won't happen (in the case of NIPSCO's rate increase) when the 30 days are up," said Connelly.

He said telegrams will be sent to C. Jackson Grayson Jr., chairman of the Price Commission, this weekend asking for a hearing in Lake County.

"We are asking for an investigation of the NIPSCO rate structure," he said.

The four groups distributed a "NIPSCO fact sheet" asserting that "NIPSCO wants the consumer to pay rather than to cut into its stockholders' profits."

The company is short on funds to finance its expansion of electric plants, proposed at \$429 million while the present plants' value is \$562 million, the CCC sheet noted.

It also points out that NIPSCO earned a profit of \$27 million from residential and commercial users while losing \$10 million from industrial users.

"We say to NIPSCO that if it needs \$10 million, make industry pay their share," said the release.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. MITCHELL (at the request of Mr. Boggs), for today, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. VANIK, for 30 minutes, on Wednesday, March 15; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. FRENZEL) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. ESCH, for 60 minutes, March 21.

Mr. HEINZ, for 10 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DENHOLM) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. REUSS, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. KARTH, for 10 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. SIKES in five instances, and to include extraneous material.

Mr. CABELL, and to include extraneous material.

Mr. HALL and to include pertinent material.

Mr. MADDEN and to include extraneous material.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. FRENZEL) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BURKE of Florida.

Mr. HOGAN in 10 instances.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan.

Mr. ROBISON of New York.

Mr. SCHWENGER.

Mr. FISH in two instances.

Mr. HORTON in two instances.

Mr. MIZELL in five instances.

Mr. McDADE.

Mr. BRAY in three instances.

Mr. HOSMER in two instances.

Mr. SCHERLE.

Mr. ROUSSELOT.

Mr. LENT.

Mr. FRENZEL in two instances.

Mr. CONTE.

Mr. BELCHER.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama.

Mr. WYMAN in two instances.

Mr. KEITH.

Mr. MORSE.

Mr. McCLORY.

Mr. DERWINSKI.

Mr. BUCHANAN.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DENHOLM) and to include extraneous material:)

Mr. NATCHER.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas in six instances.

Mr. EILBERG.

Mr. GAYDOS in five instances.

Mr. VANIK in three instances.

Mr. HAMILTON in two instances.
 Mr. DRINAN in three instances.
 Mr. HAGAN in three instances.
 Mr. RARICK in three instances.
 Mr. ROGERS in five instances.
 Mr. KLUCZYNSKI in three instances.
 Mr. FOUNTAIN in two instances.
 Mr. ROYBAL in two instances.
 Mr. SCHEUER.
 Mr. BERGLAND in three instances.
 Mrs. ABZUG in 10 instances.
 Mr. MITCHELL in five instances.
 Mr. CARNEY.
 Mr. ZABLOCKI in two instances.
 Mr. CAREY of New York.
 Mr. GIAIMO in three instances.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. HAYS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 8293. An act to continue until the close of September 30, 1973, the International Coffee Agreement Act of 1968.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. HAYS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on March 13, 1972 present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 1746. An act to further promote equal employment opportunities for American workers.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 11 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 15, 1972, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1735. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting plans for various watershed works of improvement, none of which involves a structure which provides for more than 4,000 acre-feet of total capacity, pursuant to 16 U.S.C. 1005; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1736. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations, transmitting a copy of a determination by the Secretary of State that furnishing of assistance to Ecuador under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, is important to the national interest of the United States, pursuant to section 113 of the Foreign Assistance and Related Programs Appropriation Act, 1972, and Executive Order 10973; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1737. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics), transmitting a report of independent research and development and bid and proposal costs, pursuant to section 203(c) of Public Law 91-441; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1738. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics), transmitting detailed backup data for the

report of independent research and development and bid and proposal costs, pursuant to section 203(c) of Public Law 91-441; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1739. A letter from the Commander, Naval Facilities Engineering Command, Department of the Navy, transmitting a semiannual report for the period ended December 31, 1971, on Navy military construction contracts awarded on other than a competitive-bid basis to the lowest responsible bidder, pursuant to section 704 of Public Law 92-145; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1740. A letter from the Chief Commissioner, U.S. Court of Claims, transmitting copies of the opinion and findings of fact by the court in the case of *John S. Attinello v. The United States*, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 1492 and 2509 and to House Resolution 401 of the 92d Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1741. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting plans for various watershed works of improvement, each of which involves a structure which provides more than 4,000 acre-feet of total capacity, pursuant to 16 U.S.C. 1005; to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee: Select Committee on Small Business. Report on small business problems in metric conversion (Rept. No. 92-913). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MORGAN: Committee of conference. Conference report on S. 18 (Rept. No. 92-914). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. STAGGERS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H.R. 4174. A bill to amend the Uniform Time Act to allow an option in the adoption of advanced time in certain cases; with an amendment (Rept. No. 92-915). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. O'NEILL: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 897. A resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 45. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code by adding a new chapter 404 to establish an Institute for Continuing Studies of Juvenile Justice (Rept. No. 92-916). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DELANEY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 898. A resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 11417. A bill to amend the Rail Passenger Service Act of 1970 to provide financial assistance to the National Railroad Passenger Corp. for the purpose of purchasing railroad equipment, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 92-917). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. OBEY (for himself, Mr. ABOUREZZK, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. BERGLAND, Mr. BROWN of Michigan, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. FISH, Mr. FLOWERS, Mr. GRIFFIN, Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. ICHORD, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. LINK, Mr. MELCHER, Mr. O'HARA, Mr. PODELL, Mr. PREYER of North Carolina, Mr. ROY, Mr. THONE, and Mr. YATRON):

H.R. 13782. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, to provide for adjustments

in the support price of milk during its marketing year; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. ABZUG:

H.R. 13783. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to provide that retirees' benefits are a mandatory subject of collective bargaining; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 13784. A bill to expand the membership of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations to include elected school board officials; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. BROWN of Michigan:

H.R. 13785. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 41) to provide that under certain circumstances exclusive territorial arrangements shall not be deemed unlawful; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 13786. A bill to amend the act of May 19, 1948, with respect to the use of real property for wildlife conservation purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CHAPPELL (for himself, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. OBEY, Mr. LENT, Mr. DULSKI, Mr. WOLFF, Mr. DAVIS of South Carolina, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin, Mr. REES, Mr. McEWEEN, Mrs. GREEN of Oregon, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. DOW, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. O'HARA, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. ROY, Mr. BRADEMANS, Mrs. GRASSO, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. MINK):

H.R. 13787. A bill to require the payment of interest on escrow accounts held in connection with residential real estate mortgage loans; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CLEVELAND:

H.R. 13788. A bill to make the use of a firearm to commit certain felonies a Federal crime where that use violates State law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FAUNTROY:

H.R. 13789. A bill to enable the blind and the otherwise physically disabled to participate fully in the social and economic life of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on District of Columbia.

By Mr. FLOOD (for himself, Mr. MORGAN, Mr. EDMONDSON, Mr. CONTE, Mr. SHRIVER, Mr. PATTEN, Mr. KEE, Mr. CARTER, Mr. BROWN of Michigan, Mr. HANSEN of Idaho, and Mr. ROY):

H.R. 13790. A bill to extend for 3 years the District of Columbia Medical and Dental Manpower Act of 1970; to the Committee on District of Columbia.

By Mr. GIBBONS:

H.R. 13791. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that no interest shall be payable by a person to whom an erroneous refund is made if the erroneous refund is made due to error by an officer or employee of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H.R. 13792. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to limit, and to provide more effective control with respect to the use of Government production equipment by private contractors under contracts entered into by the Department of Defense and certain other Federal agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HALPERN (for himself, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. MADDEN, Mr. RYAN, Mrs. ABZUG, Mr. NIX, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. PODELL, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. ADDABO, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. RUNNELS, and Mrs. GRASSO):

H.R. 13793. A bill to protect the public health by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to assure the safety, reliability, and effectiveness of medical devices; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HEINZ:

H.R. 13794. A bill to amend titles II and XVIII of the Social Security Act to include qualified drugs, requiring a physician's prescription or certification and approved by a formulary committee, among the items and services covered under the hospital insurance program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEMP:

H.R. 13795. A bill to amend chapter 9 of title 44, United States Code, to require the use of recycled paper in the printing of the Congressional Record; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. PIKE:

H.R. 13796. A bill to expand the membership of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations to include elected school board officials; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 13797. A bill to amend section 103 of title 23 of the United States Code relating to additional mileage for the Interstate System; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SCHERLE:

H.R. 13798. A bill for the relief of certain cities and towns in Iowa and the State of Iowa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (by request) (for himself, Mr. TEAGUE of California, Mr. DORN, and Mr. HAMMER-SCHMIDT):

H.R. 13799. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the rates of compensation for disabled veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WHALLEY:

H.R. 13800. A bill to amend the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 to require the Secretary of Labor to recognize the difference in hazards to employees between the heavy construction industry and the light residential construction industry; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WHITE:

H.R. 13801. A bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces and \$1 pieces in commem-

oration of the bicentennial of the American Revolution; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mrs. ABZUG:

H.J. Res. 1105. Joint resolution to authorize the President to call a series of four White House Issue-Oriented Subconferences on Aging; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.J. Res. 1106. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the nomination of individuals for election to the offices of the President and Vice President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALL:

H.J. Res. 1107. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to limit the tenure of office of Senators and Representatives and to provide an age limit for Senators and Representatives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUNNELS (for himself and Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia):

H.J. Res. 1108. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States limiting deficit spending by the Federal Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H. Con. Res. 557. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of House Report 92-911; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. KEE:

H. Con. Res. 558. Concurrent resolution providing for the installation of security apparatus for the protection of the Capitol complex; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. Con. Res. 559. Concurrent resolution providing for the printing of the report entitled "Papers Submitted to Subcommittee on Housing Panels on Housing Production, Housing Demand, and Developing a Suitable Living Environment"; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. Con. Res. 560. Concurrent resolution providing for the printing of the report entitled "Housing and the Urban Environment, Report and Recommendations of Three Study Panels of the Subcommittee on Housing"; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts:

H. Res. 895. Resolution expressing the sense of the House with respect to the Soviet Union's violations of human rights and basic freedoms, in contravention of the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. NIX:

H. Res. 896. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the President should suspend, in accordance with section 481 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, economic and military assistance and certain sales to Thailand for its failure to take adequate steps to control the illegal traffic of opium through its borders; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

336. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Kansas, relative to the Federal highway trust fund, which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 13802. A bill for the relief of Appalachian Hospitals, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG of Florida:

H.R. 13803. A bill for the relief of Roy E. Lindquist; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE—Tuesday, March 14, 1972

The Senate met at 12 meridian and was called to order by Hon. ADLAI E. STEVENSON III, a Senator from the State of Illinois.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

God of our fathers and our God, amid the turmoil and tensions of our times we pause to place our lives in the light of Thy holy presence. Search out our inner beings. Look upon our motives, our longings, our aspirations, and our deepest needs. Forgive our sins and by Thy grace make us better than we have been.

O Lord, make us receptive to the truth Thou dost make known to us. Keep us firm in the right, magnanimous with others, thankful for every increase in righteousness and justice. Give us wisdom to be the instruments of Thy purpose for mankind. Through human hands and human minds give divine direction to the course of history.

In the Redeemer's name, we pray. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF THE ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. ELLENDER).

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., March 14, 1972.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate on official duties, I appoint Hon. ADLAI E. STEVENSON III, a Senator from the State of Illinois, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
President pro tempore.

Mr. STEVENSON thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Leonard, one of his secretaries, and he announced that

the President had approved and signed the following acts and joint resolution:

On March 9, 1972:

S. 2896. An act to amend chapter 83 of title 5, United States Code, relating to adopted child.

On March 10, 1972:

S. 748. An act to authorize payment and appropriation of the second and third installments of the U.S. contributions to the Fund for Special Operations of the Inter-American Development Bank;

S. 749. An act to authorize U.S. contributions to the Special Funds of the Asian Development Bank;

S. 2010. An act to provide for increased participation by the United States in the International Development Association; and

S.J. Res. 189. Joint resolution to authorize the President to designate the period beginning March 26, 1972, as "National Week of Concern for Prisoners of War/Missing in Action" and to designate Sunday, March 26, 1972, as a national day of prayer for these Americans.

REPORT ON AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ACTIVITIES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore (Mr. STEVENSON) laid before the